

The University of Chicago

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL
PRINCIPALSHIP

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1934

By
PAUL REVERE PIERCE

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1935

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO., NEW YORK; THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY
PRESS, LONDON; THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA,
KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI; THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LIMITED, SHANGHAI

The University of Chicago

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL
PRINCIPALSHIP

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1934

By
PAUL REVERE PIERCE

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1935

COPYRIGHT 1935 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PUBLISHED FEBRUARY 1935

COMPOSED AND PRINTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.



INTRODUCTION

The literature on educational administration is conspicuously barren in historical accounts of the origin and development of our leading officers in public-school administration. Such accounts as do exist are fragmentary and report chiefly episodes of these officers in the management of local schools. As a result, the basis for generalization regarding the professional status of modern administrative officers in public schools is decidedly inadequate.

The idea of tracing the genetic development of one of these officers, the public-school principal, occurred to the author as a task worthy of extended research. Accordingly, with the approval of his sponsoring professor, he undertook the problem as a Doctoral in Education. The results herewith reported. For data he went to the reports of executive officers in two hundred pages of these reports. One hundred years of the history of the development of the principalship and the conditions which have led to the modern principalship.

The first part of the study is devoted to the first time an author has attempted to trace the growth and development of the principalship. The duties of the principal are discussed. A careful reading of the study by principal officers of principalship should result in a new understanding of the professional responsibilities of administrative officers. The forces which gave rise to the development of the earliest professional powers and duties of principals are even stronger and more essential today than they were at the time lay officers of boards of education began to seek professional assistance in the organization, administration, and supervision of local schools by turning to superior teachers and clothing them with certain administrative responsibilities too technical for laymen satisfactorily to perform. The further evolution of the professional responsibilities of principals occasioned by the rapid growth of cities and the development of the city superintendent of schools provides the immediate historical background of the modern principalship, without which a full appreciation of the professional status of the

COPYRIGHT 1935 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PUBLISHED FEBRUARY 1935

COMPOSED AND PRINTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.



INTRODUCTION

The literature on educational administration is conspicuously barren in historical accounts of the origin and development of our leading officers in public-school administration. Such accounts as do exist are fragmentary and report chiefly episodes of these officers in the management of local schools. As a result, the basis for generalization regarding the professional status of modern administrative officers in public schools is decidedly inadequate.

The idea of tracing the genetic development of one of these officers, the public-school principal, occurred to the author as a task worthy of extended research. Accordingly, with the approval of his sponsoring professor, he undertook the problem as a Doctoral investigation with the results herewith reported. For data he went to the published annual reports of executive officers in twelve city school systems. By perusing thousands of pages of these reports, covering a period of school history of one-hundred years, he was able to discover the order of development of the major duties assigned to school principals and the conditions which gave impetus to the development of the modern principalship.

The findings of the investigation provide for the first time an authentic picture in retrospect of the growth and development of the principalship and furnish the criteria for evaluating the duties now performed by school principals. A careful reading of the study by principals and by supervisory officers of principals should result in a new conception of the professional responsibilities of administrative officers. The forces which gave rise to the development of the earliest professional powers and duties of principals are even stronger and more essential today than they were at the time lay officers of boards of education began to seek professional assistance in the organization, administration, and supervision of local schools by turning to superior teachers and clothing them with certain administrative responsibilities too technical for laymen satisfactorily to perform. The further evolution of the professional responsibilities of principals occasioned by the rapid growth of cities and the development of the city superintendent of schools provides the immediate historical background of the modern principalship, without which a full appreciation of the professional status of the

principal would be scarcely possible.

The principalship is still an evolving position. If the schools of the country at large are taken into consideration almost all stages in the development of the office can be found. The condition makes all the more essential to teachers and administrative officers who aspire to a professional career in the school principalship a knowledge of the origin and development of the position. This knowledge has been placed within the reach of every principal in the United States by the contribution here presented.

William C. Reavis

University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Purpose of the Investigation	
The Principalship of Elementary and Secondary Schools	
Sources of Data	
Technique Employed	
 II. THE RISE OF THE MODERN PRINCIPALSHIP.	 7
Factors Retarding Development	
How Grading Accelerated Development	
The Principal Teacher	
Nature of First Administrative Duties	
Freeing the Principal from Teaching Duties	
The Beginnings of Supervision by Principals	
Reaction to Central Office Supervision	
A Period of Professional Reaction	
The Period of Professional Leadership	
The Principalship Today	
 III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PRINCIPAL.	 25
Administrative Duties Defined	
Early School-Board Rules	
Extension of Administrative Activities	
Growth of Prescribed Duties from 1853 to 1900	
Administrative Duties from 1900 to 1933	
The Attitude of the Superintendent	
 IV. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL	 57
Supervisory Activities of Principals Prior to 1900	
Growth of Supervisory Functions of Principals from 1900 to 1918	
Supervisory Activities of Principals Established since 1920	

Chapter	Page
V. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PRINCIPAL TO GENERAL AND SPECIAL SUPERVISORS.	89
General Supervisors and Principals Prior to 1900	
The Period from 1900 to 1918	
Development Since 1918	
Summary	
Principals and Special Supervisors Prior to 1900	
Development from 1900 to 1918	
Development after 1918	
Summary	
VI. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL AS A COMMUNITY LEADER.	123
Community Leadership of Principals Prior to 1900	
Community Leadership of Principals from 1900 to 1918	
Community Leadership of Principals since 1918	
VII. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PERSONNEL OF THE PRINCIPALSHIP	152
Qualifications of Principals Prior to 1875	
Development of the Qualifications of Principals from 1875 to 1900	
Development in Personnel from 1900 to 1918	
Development of the Personnel of the Principalship since 1918	
VIII. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF THE PRINCIPAL	179
Evidences of Professional Growth of Principals Prior to 1900	
The Professional Status of Principals from 1900 to 1918	
The Professional Advancement of Principals since 1918	
IX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	210
Administrative Responsibilities	
Supervisory Functions	
Relations with General and Special Supervisors	
The Principal as a Community Leader	
The Personnel of the Principalship	
The Professional Status of the Principal	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	222

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Numbers and Dates of Issue of Reports Utilized in This Investigation.	3
II. Activities Initiated by Principals from 1915 to 1930.	54
III. Number of Special Teachers of Music, Drawing, Physical Education, Sewing and Handwriting, and Number of Elementary Principals in New York in 1904, 1908, and 1912.	115
IV. Number of Applications for Elementary Certificates Granted and Number Refused in New York City from 1901 to 1916	171
V. Maximum Salaries Paid to Male and Female Principals in Large Cities, 1855	180
VI. Salaries of Principals and Supervisors in Six Large Cities in 1909.	192
VII. Increases in Salaries of Elementary-School Principals in Large Cities, 1921-23.	201
VIII. Salary Schedule of Principals in Elementary Schools Having 25 or More Classes, 1929	203

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Investigation

The modern principal occupies a key position in the administration of large city-school systems. He bears the chief responsibility for the efficient operation of elementary and secondary schools. In accordance with the general policies of the superintendent, he initiates local administrative procedures, supervises classroom instruction, furnishes educational leadership for the school community, and serves as the professional leader of his school staff. However, the position of the principal has not always been so significant. Most of his important duties and powers have resulted from a long period of development. To trace this development in its functional aspects is the purpose of the study here presented.

The Principalship of Elementary and Secondary Schools

The modern public-school principalship had its beginnings in our early high schools. These high schools were patterned after the private academies of the late Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Centuries. The early high-school principal had responsibilities very similar to those of the headmaster of the academy. He had a small number of teachers to direct, and only simple administrative duties to perform. A large share of his time was spent in teaching.¹

The chief factors influencing the early development of the principalship were common to the elementary school and the high school. One factor was the emphasis placed on grading for a number of decades subsequent to 1835.² Another factor was the

¹Catalogue of the St. Louis High School, December, 1862, p. 4. (Appendix, Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis), 1866.

²Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1860, pp. 19-20, 54.

size of schools. In the beginning, high schools, like elementary schools, were small. The enrolment of the St. Louis High School in its first year (1853) was 72 pupils,¹ and the enrolment of the Chicago High School in its fourth year (1859) was 286 pupils.² However, both elementary schools and high schools increased in size as a result of the rapid growth of cities.³ Further factors common to the two types of schools were the maintenance of separate departments for boys and girls, and the requirement in each that the principal teach part of the time. As the public secondary school evolved into an integral extension of the elementary school, a definite relationship developed between the principalships of the two units.

Sources of Data

The present study deals specifically with the principalship as it developed in large cities. It was in the large metropolitan centers that schools first grew to considerable size and acquired the greatest complexity of organization. The highest and most rapid development of the principalship resulted from conditions and problems connected with schools of this type.

Twelve cities were selected for the purpose of the study, namely, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Minneapolis, New York, Philadelphia, Providence, St. Louis, and San Francisco. The selection was made after sampling the official school records of more than twenty large cities, and was based not only on the present size of the cities, but also on their size during the early development of public schools. The school systems of Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, New York, and St. Louis were especially prominent during the last half of the Nineteenth Century. They ranked among the largest in the country, published comprehensive reports, and were frequently cited for their excellence by school officials of other cities.⁴

The annual reports of superintendents proved to be the best sources of data regarding the principalship. Superintendents

¹Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1860, p. 15.

²Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, p. 47.

³Sixteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1870, pp. 13-17, 85.

⁴Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1871, pp. 11-12.

reported statistical data, specified the sphere of the principal's activities, evaluated his accomplishments, and stated the goals for which he should strive. The reports of assistant superintendents were often included in the report of the superintendent. These reports were valuable for detailed accounts of the principal's activities and for the points of view of immediate superior officers regarding the principal's functions. The reports of principals revealed the principal's outlook on various phases of his own work, but they appeared at infrequent intervals in the superintendents' reports. As a rule, the reports of superintendents were included in the annual reports of school boards, although in some instances, notably New York, the report of the superintendent appeared as a separate volume. In some cities, the value of the school records were marred through failure of boards, during certain years, to publish reports. The number of annual reports read for the present study is shown in Table I. The length of

TABLE I

NUMBERS, AND DATES OF ISSUE, OF ANNUAL REPORTS UTILIZED
IN THIS INVESTIGATION

City	Number of Reports	Dates of Issue
Baltimore	50	1880-93; 1895-99; 1901-02; 1904-32
Boston	79	1851-1911; 1915-17; 1919-33
Chicago	67	1854-1915; 1918; 1922; 1924-26
Cincinnati	29	1833; 1835; 1838-53; 1860-62; 1865; 1867; 1869; 1872; 1894-97; 1900; 1906-11; 1915-17
Cleveland	52	1866; 1868-80; 1883-87; 1894-95; 1897-1912; 1914; 1916-21; 1925-32
Detroit	28	1855; 1894-99; 1909; 1911-18; 1920-31
Minneapolis	24	1890; 1892; 1894-97; 1900-01; 1904-14; 1924-28
New York	75	1850; 1853-56; 1858-96; 1898-1917; 1921-23; 1925-32
Philadelphia ...	45	1847; 1849; 1851-52; 1857; 1866; 1870-71; 1881-85; 1893-94; 1900-01; 1905-32
Providence	49	1870; 1883; 1885-91; 1893-1932
St. Louis	73	1860-83; 1885-1933
San Francisco ..	26	1883-84; 1889-95; 1897-98; 1907-10; 1912; 1924-33

superintendents' reports varied considerably, a sampling showing a range from 48 to 922 pages.

The minutes and proceedings of school boards were utilized mainly for supplementing the data in the annual reports, and at times for supplying information when annual reports were missing. Rules and regulations of school boards dealt chiefly with administrative aspects of the principal's work. Their main value for revealing developmental trends was limited to the decades from 1840 to 1890. The annual reports of the president, business manager, and special committees of the board at times contained illuminating points of view regarding the activities and responsibilities of principals.

It is to be regretted that more of the reports of principals to their superior officers, especially prior to 1910, were not preserved or published. Such reports would have given added light on the hopes and ambitions of principals themselves during those years. The minutes of principals' associations, where preserved, have to a certain extent filled the gap. Principals published little concerning their own problems prior to 1910. Subsequent to 1920, when they finally began to study their problems and to publish results in considerable volume, accounts of their activities were included in the annual reports of the superintendents and assistant superintendents. This fact accounts for the absence, except in rare instances, of citations in this study from the yearbooks and other publications of principals' associations.

Technique Employed

The first step in the collection of the data for the investigation was to read the sources and search out all passages referring to the principal. These passages were designated for note-taking with only two exceptions: (1) data regarding a function of the principal were not considered after the function became clearly established in a given school system, and (2) data on functions peculiar to principals of special classes of schools, such as high schools and trade schools, were omitted. The aim was to record only characteristics common to all principals. The number of the volume, the year it was issued, and the page number of the reference were recorded on cards. An approximate heading, such as "salaries," "community," or "administration" designated the content of each note. In most cases, passages were copied in their entirety.

When all materials were on hand in note form, classification was begun. In the first sorting, special attention was given

to the broad phases of development treated under chapter headings. Two tentative headings, "the principal's responsibility as head of his school" and "duties of principals" were replaced by the headings "administrative responsibilities" and "supervisory functions." This sorting aided in determining the scope of closely related chapters; for example, data relating to the professional development of the principal prior to his appointment were grouped under "personnel of the principalship" and materials connected with professional development of the principal subsequent to appointment were classified under "professional status" of the principal. The phases of development finally selected for treatment in chapter divisions were as follows: (1) administrative responsibilities (including office organization), (2) supervisory functions, (3) relationship to general and special supervisors, (4) community leadership, (5) personnel of the principalship, (6) professional status.

Grouping all data into subdivisions under each chapter heading was next undertaken. Often this involved a regrouping under the subdivisions, as in the case of assignment of special duties to teachers, effecting a permanent organization, and the like under "organization," a subdivision of "administrative responsibilities." Careful study of the content of the subseries made it possible to determine approximate subtitles and construct a tentative outline of the chapter.

An important problem of procedure still remained, namely, the selection of the facts in each series to be used in the final exposition. Obviously, not all of the data could be used in describing trends or as bases for generalizations. More than the mere recording of facts in chronological order is required to portray development.

In the main, the principles of historical technique were utilized in the selection of facts. Certain data, such as rules and regulations of school boards, salary schedules, and certification requirements were susceptible to statistical treatment. Wherever mass data could be utilized to show trends, the statistical method was utilized as an auxiliary aid. For the most part, however, the data of a given series were carefully sampled, and those facts which most accurately and typically illustrated a trend or provided bases for a generalization were utilized. An illustration is afforded in the policy of freeing principals from teaching duties in order that they might supervise instruction. This trend was quite general in large cities in the decades subsequent to 1860. The method generally used was to provide head-assistants to take over part of the principals' teaching duties and to keep the school records. The practices followed in Chicago

and Boston were the most typical and clear-cut; consequently they were cited to illustrate the trend. Consideration was also given in the selection of data to such factors as causal connections and current educational history.

Undue importance should not be attached to dates cited in connection with the introduction of new activities of principals. The citing of a procedure of a principal in the annual report of a superintendent is no indication that it had not been practiced previously, either in the city in question, or in other cities. Possibly the safest interpretation to place on a date of this type is that it marks a certain degree of development in the procedure in question. This may be regarded as characteristic of activities of principals which are cited in superintendents' reports.

CHAPTER II

THE RISE OF THE MODERN PRINCIPALSHIP

The development of the modern public-school principalship received impetus, at various stages, from a number of diverse factors. Prominent among these were the rapid growth of cities, the grading of schools, the consolidation of departments under a single principal, the freeing of the principal from teaching duties, recognition of the principal as the supervisory head of the school, and finally, the establishment of the Departments of Elementary-School and Secondary-School Principals within the National Education Association. Obstacles were encountered, such as "double-headed schools," the influence of the Lancastrian system, and the conservatism and professional inertia of a large proportion of the principals. These obstacles at times resulted in periods of quiescence, which delayed but did not inhibit the eventual development of the principalship.

The growth of cities was an important factor in the transfer of local supervision from the superintendent to the principal. One of the main functions of the early superintendents was to grade the schools. The growth of cities, which became marked about 1830, continued at such a rapid pace in the subsequent decades that school enrolments were multiplied many times. The problems in administration thus created made so many demands on the time of the superintendents that they were unable to give personal attention to the management and supervision of local schools. The logical step was to turn local management of schools over to the principals. Dr. William T. Harris described the process as follows:

"Experiments have been in progress for two years to ascertain the most efficient organization for large schools and also for groups of schools. A system continually increasing in size requires frequent changes in its organization, in order to preserve the balance between its local and central interests. When the number of pupils in a school system increases from 5,000 to 20,000, the duties of the superintendent and Board of Directors not only become more complex, but they change essentially in quality or kind. In the former case their local importance predominates. When there are only 5,000 pupils the schools can be frequently visited by the superintendent and much stimulated by his personal presence:

petty cases of discipline can be settled by him; he can examine the methods of discipline and instruction and the proficiency of the pupils in each department. With 20,000 pupils this becomes impossible and the system of supervision must expand so as to leave the local supervision to independent principals in a large measure."¹

Factors Retarding Development

A retarding factor in the early development of the principalship was the influence of the Lancastrian system of instruction on both the organization of instruction and the layout of school buildings. Superintendent Divoll, in describing the condition of St. Louis Schools from 1849 to 1857, gave a vivid account of the after-effects of the Lancastrian system:

"It is not at all surprising that in the early history of the schools the buildings were constructed in the styles we find them. The Lancasterian or monitorial system, so called, was much in vogue in those days on account of its being deemed economical. The school-rooms which it required were simply a large study hall with one or more small classrooms attached. The Principal occupied the large hall, preserved order during study hours, and instructed one or two classes; while the other pupils went to the classrooms to recite to assistant teachers or monitors When the monitors gave place to assistant teachers, another step was taken in advance."²

Another factor which retarded the development of the principalship was the "double-headed school." This institution had its origin in the introduction of grammar masters into the schools of Boston in 1740.³ The grammar masters, who were to teach reading, grammar, geography and other subjects, were required to share the school with the writing masters. The children in each school were divided into two groups, one attending the writing school which was usually downstairs, in the morning, and going to the grammar master, upstairs, in the afternoon. The other group attended the classes in the reverse order. Thus, there was divided authority in the one building.⁴

¹Seventeenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1871, p. 189.

²Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1867, p. 110.

³Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1903, p. 50.

⁴Ibid., pp. 47-49.

Admission of girls to the schools led to further variation in forms of organization. Often several separate "departments" or schools, with separate heads or principals, were housed in a single building. This trend was often augmented by the layout of old school buildings designed for the Lancastrian system of instruction. Superintendent Divoll described the harmful effects of schools having several separate departments as follows:

"The organization of independent departments under the old system, consequent upon the peculiar construction of the houses, required several principals in the same building, thus destroying the unity of the school and rendering the classification very imperfect."¹

The establishment of the Quincy School in Boston in 1847 has usually been cited as the first school to have all departments united under a single principal. The chief credit for this step was given to the principal, John Philbrick, who later became Superintendent of the Schools of Boston. However, school records show that the policy of placing all departments of a school under a single head was practiced in the young and rapidly growing city of Cincinnati prior to 1838, at least ten years earlier than the Quincy precedent. The school trustees in 1838 reported regarding the policy as follows:

"The Board have endeavored to place the control of the houses, so far as the regulation of scholars is concerned, under the charge of principals to whom the assistants are subject in the minor arrangements of government, classification, &c. . . . According to the resolution grading the teachers, and fixing their salaries, there can but one controlling principal be appointed in each house, or district, to whom, with the appropriate visitor, it is intended to confide the grading of the schools, the classification of the pupils, and the arrangement of those under their respective teachers.' How far this plan will succeed in securing a better organization of the schools than has heretofore been practicable, must be determined by the experience of the coming year; but from the trial which has already been made in some of the schools it is thought it will be eminently successful."²

In 1859, St. Louis adopted the policy of having but "one principal in each building, all the other teachers being assistants."³ Chicago, in 1860, dropped the terms "primary" and

¹Thirteenth Annual Report, St. Louis, op. cit., p. 112.

²Ninth Annual Report of the Trustees and Visitors of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1838, p. 5.

³Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1859, p. 25.

"grammar" departments, and introduced instead, the term "graded schools." At the same time, the office of head assistant was established as an aid to the principal in place of the former office of principal of the primary department.¹

The fact that western cities, such as Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Chicago were soon able to rid themselves of double-headed or departmental schools was doubtless due to the fact that this inheritance from early school organization never became so strongly entrenched as in the cities of the East. New ideas in school organization, such as the policy of having a single principal in charge of a school, could be introduced in the young cities of the West without the necessity of overcoming traditional practices and the inertia and opposition of reactionary school officers and teachers. It might almost be said that the principalship in the western cities had the twofold advantage of having the East as a source from which to draw educational ideas and the West as virgin soil in which to try them out.

In the large cities of the East the situation, except in Boston, was not so favorable. Boston, owing mainly to the effective leadership of Philbrick, was able in 1855, to dispose of the last of the double-headed schools.² New York, on the other hand, was not so fortunate. In 1889, there were still twenty-three schools in the city, each having male, female, and primary departments. As late as 1903, the problem still occupied the attention of school officials, as indicated by the following excerpt from Superintendent Maxwell's report:

"In many of the elementary buildings in the boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx, it was found that two, or in some cases, three distinct school organizations under two or three independent principals existed under the same roof. As opportunity occurred the Board of Superintendents recommended and your Board approved the recommendation, to consolidate three of these organizations into two, and two of them into one."³

How Grading Accelerated Development

While the early advancement of the principalship was retarded by the Lancastrian System and double-headed schools, it

¹Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1860, pp. 20-21.

²Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1855, p. 11.

³Fifth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1903, p. 107.

was accelerated, on the other hand, by the grading of schools. Grading of schools was one of the main reasons for the introduction of superintendents.¹ Graded courses of study were introduced. It was soon evident that one authority must be responsible for the co-ordinating of the work of the various departments and securing continuity of materials and progress through the various grades. The rapid increase in size of cities likewise made it evident that the superintendent could not long exercise this function. The logical thing, therefore, was to give the principal the local responsibility for properly grading and classifying the pupils in each school. Effective grading revealed the fallacy of having several separate departments with independent heads, and hastened the appointment of a single principal in each school. It also proved to be an opening wedge for freeing the principal, for at least part of his time, from teaching duties.² Thus grading of schools was a large factor in making the principal the actual, as well as the titular, head of his school.

The Principal Teacher

The influence of teaching duties on the principalship was limited chiefly to the early stages of its development. The term "Principal Teacher" was a common designation for the controlling head of the school in the early reports of school boards, indicating that teaching was the chief duty. The term "Principal" however, appeared in the Common School Report³ of Cincinnati as early as 1838, and Horace Mann⁴ referred to a "male principal" in his annual report of 1841.

The relations of the early "principal teacher" to the other teachers in the building was sometimes a matter of concern, especially to the teachers. An inquiry was addressed to the Board of Education in Cincinnati in 1839, by the Common School Teachers' Association, to determine the relative duties of principal and assistant teachers, especially when they occupied different school rooms. A committee, of which the President of the Board was chairman, undertook to reply to the Association. It was the feeling

¹First Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1853, pp. 3-4.

²Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1862, p. 37.

³Ibid., p. 5.

⁴Fourth Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board of Education of Massachusetts, 1841, p. 25.

of the committee that the terms, "principal" and "assistant" went far to explain the relationship. However, judging that the request of the Association called for a more detailed statement, the committee outlined what they deemed the chief responsibilities of the principal teacher and his assistants.

The principal teacher was (1) to function as the head of the school charged to his care, (2) to regulate the classes and course of instruction of all the pupils, whether they occupied his room or the rooms of other teachers, (3) to discover any defects in the school and apply remedies, (4) to make defects known to the visitor or trustee of ward, or district, if he were unable to remedy conditions, (5) to give necessary instruction to his assistants, (6) to classify pupils, (7) to safeguard school houses and furniture, (8) to keep the school clean, (9) to instruct assistants, (10) to refrain from impairing the standing of assistants, especially in the eyes of their pupils, and (11) to require the co-operation of his assistants.

The assistant teachers, on the other hand, were (1) to regard the principal teacher as the head of the school, (2) to observe his directions, (3) to guard his reputation, and (4) to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with the rules and regulations adopted for the government of the schools.

The committee further pointed out that principal teachers were selected on account of their knowledge of teaching methods, characteristics of children, and common problems of schools. Lack of firmness in the performance of duties by the principal teacher was at times felt by the trustees. Many assistant teachers were so well versed in their work as to require little or no instruction from principals, but this fact should not interfere with wholesome working relations. Mutual co-operation between principal and assistant teachers was especially important, the committee felt, because of frequent changes in the teaching personnel, and because, without it, good order and teaching efforts would suffer.¹

By the middle of the Nineteenth Century, the principalship in large cities had acquired certain outstanding characteristics: (1) a teaching male principal as the controlling head of the school, (2) female and primary departments with women principals under the direction of the male principal, and (3) prescribed duties which were limited largely to discipline, routine administrative acts, and grading of pupils in the various rooms. Two conceptions destined to improve the position of the principal-

¹Tenth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1839, pp. 22-24.

ship were beginning to attain acceptance: the uniting of all departments under one principal, and the freeing of the principal from teaching duties to supervise the work of all rooms of the school.

Nature of First Administrative Duties

The administrative nature of most of the duties delegated to the principal teachers is revealed by the "lists of duties" appearing in the early annual reports of school boards. The duties of the principal teacher in Cincinnati in 1839 have already been broadly characterized. A condensed summary of the duties of "Male Principals" appeared in the board report of the same city in 1853. It gives such a detailed picture of the principal's work in the middle of the century that it is herewith quoted in its main essentials:

"The Male Principal, as the local superintendent, is responsible for the observance and enforcement of the rules and regulations of the Board for the guidance and directions of Teachers and government of the schools, and is accordingly invested with authority to carry them into effect.

"With the cooperation of the Female Principal, he is to classify the pupils in the different grades above the primary department, according to their advancement in arithmetical studies. He shall employ half an hour each day in visiting the Schools of his District, and shall announce to the other departments, by the ringing of a bell, the hour for beginning and closing school, for the recitation of classes and for recess. He shall promulgate to all the Teachers such rules and regulations of general application as he may receive from the Board, and record the same on the blank leaves of the Rules and Regulations- shall transmit to the Clerk, at the close of each School month, all bills for salaries of teachers and report monthly to the Board according to blank forms furnished him, with such additional information as the Board may from time to time require, or as he may think important to communicate- and any failure, except sickness, to file with the Clerk the aforesaid report, according to the full requirements of the forms prescribed, will debar him from the reception of his salary until the same is rendered to the satisfaction of the Board. He shall transmit to the clerk, at the close of each quarter, a report of the condition of all the schools in his District, and a similar report at the close of each year. He shall also at the close of each year return to the Clerk the keys to the rooms of the house over which he has had

charge. He shall see to the safe keeping and protection of the house, furniture, apparatus, fences, trees and shrubbery and maintain the strictest cleanliness in the school and out houses. He shall require the pupils not to appear in or about the yard earlier than fifteen minutes before the opening of the school, and prevent them by noise or otherwise from annoying the neighborhood of the school. He shall provide for the sweeping and scrubbing, lighting and maintaining the fires of the house, by some suitable person or persons acceptable to the local Trustees, and for payment of the same, shall make an equal per cent assessment on all the teachers in the house, according to their respective salaries, and any teacher declining to pay his or her share of such assessment, upon being reported to the Board, will have the same deducted from their salary. . . .

"All teachers in every house are required to be present at their respective rooms, and report themselves personally to the Male Principals of the house fifteen minutes before the opening of school in the morning, and five minutes before the opening of school in the afternoon. . . ."¹

The principal was thus an administrator of routine and a clerk. Even the classification of pupils was carried out, in that day, on a very stereotyped basis. It should be noted that the principal was in complete charge of the plant, as he both hired and directed the janitors. Teaching was still an important duty, because it was not until three years later that the School Board of Cincinnati relieved the principal of the charge of pupils in study hours, to enable him better to perform his prescribed duties.²

The type of school over which this "male principal" presided was described by the President of the Board in the following passage:

"The Common Schools are administered by a division of the city into Districts, each of which has a single school house in a central position, calculated for 600 to 1000 pupils, and at which all the children, male and female, of the District attend- the children of the different sexes occupying distinct rooms and playgrounds. Each house is in charge, subject to the District Trustees and this Board, of a male Principal,

¹Twenty-fourth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1853, p. 63.

²Thirty-first Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1860, p. 84.

assisted by a female Principal and five to twelve subordinates, each having charge of a class varying from thirty to sixty and sometimes seventy pupils."¹

Freeing the Principal from Teaching Duties

The uniting of departments into a single graded system under one principal paved the way for the introduction of graded courses of study,² thus giving the principal added responsibilities for the work in rooms other than his own. This meant that he had to have time during the period school was in session to visit and inspect the classwork of his teachers. Accordingly, superintendents began to provide means for freeing the principal from teaching duties for part of the time. A device frequently used was to make the principal and the head assistant jointly responsible for the highest division in the school, the head assistant taking the division during the periods in which the principal was to visit rooms. In 1857, Superintendent Philbrick reported that in some schools of Boston, a portion of each day, and in others, one or two half-days each week, were set aside by principals for the inspection and examination of primary classes. The head assistant took charge of the principals' classes during these periods. Philbrick regarded this as an excellent method for securing a "harmonious" progress in a large school and a practice which should be encouraged.³ In 1859, Superintendent Wells of Chicago pointed out the need for special provision by which the principals of large schools could be relieved from the immediate charge of their own rooms during a portion of each day.⁴ In 1862, he reported that head assistants were employed in five schools and extra teachers discharging all the duties of head assistants, in seven schools. The first and most important duty of the head assistant was to take charge of the principal's room in order that he might visit other rooms. In most of the schools, the principal was thus relieved about one-half of the time.⁵

¹Twenty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 9.

²Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1861, p. 6.

³Annual Report of School Committee of Boston, 1857, p. 35.

⁴Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1859, p. 43.

⁵Ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 37-38.

Superintendent Wells the same year reminded his board that in Cincinnati principals were relieved "entirely" from the charge of particular classes so that they could give all their time to the general interests of their schools. In New York City, by 1867, the principal of any school had no classroom, and no particular class or grade which he instructed, and for whose progress and efficiency he was specially responsible.¹ However, it was some years before that condition became general in the large cities throughout the country. In Chicago, as late as 1881, the principals were still required to devote as much as one-half to one-fourth of their time each day to regular class instruction.²

The Beginnings of Supervision by Principals

The freeing of the principal from teaching duties to visit other rooms proved the opening wedge for supervision by the principal. Grading and unifying the work of the school were, of course, the first considerations in the minds of superintendents and trustees when providing free time for the principal. Soon, however, the potentialities of the principal for further improvement of instruction were sensed. In 1859, Superintendent Wells of Chicago wrote as follows:

"General Supervision by Principals.- In several of the new school buildings, the number of teachers and pupils is now so large, that a considerable portion of the Principal's time is consumed in attending to matters of general oversight, and in giving such aid to the other teachers as may be necessary to secure uniformity and efficiency in all the different departments. . . ."

In 1862, Wells enumerated activities to be performed by principals during visits to other rooms, as the examination of classes, the classification of pupils, the promotion of pupils, the conducting of model lessons, and the exercising of a careful supervision over the discipline and instruction of the whole school.⁴

Another stage in the extension of the supervisory functions of principals in large cities was to make them supervisors of other schools, usually elementary schools in their own districts.

¹Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1867, p. 7.

²Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1881, p. 23 (Appendix).

³Fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 43.

⁴Ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 37-38.

The movement was thus summarized by Superintendent Harris of St. Louis in 1869:

"The plan adopted in other cities -- Boston, Cincinnati, Chicago -- gives to the several Principals of grammar schools a local supervision over those primary and intermediate grades of schools that are tributary to them. This supervision is easily given, and is most efficient in reducing the work of the lower grades to a common standard of excellence, and in the correction of false tendencies on the part of individual teachers."¹

That St. Louis followed in the steps of the cities referred to in the foregoing quotation is shown by the following excerpt from the annual report of 1871:

"Such principals of the first class schools as are designated by the Board of Education from time to time, shall rank as supervising principals and shall exercise supervisory control over such schools as are placed under their charge."²

This phase of supervision was generally discarded in the larger cities with the advent of additional supervisory forces, especially assistant superintendents, in the central office. The following passage from the report of the President of the Board of Education in St. Louis, illustrates the trend:

"The abolition of supervision by principals, so that each principal gives his entire time to his own school, and the additional assistance afforded by dividing the city between two assistant superintendents . . . will, it is believed, be of material service in improving the efficiency of the schools."³

Reaction to Central Office Supervision

The large degree of local administrative and supervisory responsibility granted to the principals of large cities tended, in many instances, to give them a marked feeling of security in their positions, and a resultant attitude of independence in their actions. At times this attitude of independence sustained them in resisting what they deemed unreasonable demands from the central office. An early example of successful resistance by

¹Fifteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1869, p. 133.

²Seventeenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. xxvii (Appendix).

³Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1888, p. 21.

principals to a policy which they considered unfair to themselves and their teachers was an occurrence in New York City in 1859. Twenty-four principals of grammar schools sent a memorial to the President of the Board, protesting that the method used in examination of pupils by the Superintendent was unjust to teachers and injurious to pupils.

The principals gave as reasons for the complaint that (1) the system employed in the examinations did not take into account the different circumstances of each school, but applied the same measuring rod indiscriminately to all schools; (2) the teachers in unfavorable localities were often compelled to work harder than those in more favored communities, with no allowance being made for differing conditions; (3) the examinations interfered with the internal management of the school, often causing teachers to emphasize procedures injurious to the real progress of the pupils; (4) the system gave the Superintendent "despotic" power, from which there was no appeal, to rate a class on the basis of an examination lasting only a few minutes; (5) it did not test, except in a mechanical way, the results secured by good teachers.¹ The committee of the School Board to which the communication of the principals was referred, directed that a meeting of all male principals be called and a committee appointed to confer with the Superintendent and his assistants. The negotiations resulted in eliminating the measures by which "teachers and schools were brought into unjust comparisons with each other," confining the account of the examinations to the "records of the schools respectively," and recording the results of the examinations by means of words instead of numerals.² This adjustment of the matter received the approval of the School Board.

However, the attitude engendered by entrenchment in their positions often resulted in reactionary tendencies on the part of principals, to the detriment both of the welfare of the schools and their own professional advancement. Superintendent Seaver of Boston, in describing the efforts of former Superintendent Philbrick to put a course of study into operation, illustrates this tendency very effectively:

"What Mr. Philbrick was prevented from accomplishing in his time was the bringing of his course of study into effective and complete operation in all the schools. There was much passive opposition to be overcome. Schoolmasters are

¹Eighteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1859, pp. 8-9.

²Ibid., pp. 10-11.

usually great for passive opposition, and perhaps none were ever greater than the Boston schoolmasters of the last generation. Each was a supreme ruler in his own school district, and relying on the support of his district committee, he could defy the interference of all other authorities, and he often did so."¹

Seaver further related that a visitor, on asking a grammar school master if he might visit the classes in natural science, was told that there were none. When the visitor insisted that natural science was in the course of study, the grammar master replied that principals allowed the superintendent to keep it there for ornamental purposes, but they did not pretend to do anything about it.²

Certain writers³ have claimed that the professional inertia and resistance to the superintendent's leadership on the part of principals led to a period in which the superintendent placed the main responsibility for supervision on a force of supervisors working from the central office.⁴ The evidence does not appear to support this view, at least in the case of large cities. The principals usually managed to keep a firm grip on supervision in their own schools, and superintendents generally, whatever they may have felt, showed no great zeal in trying to impose supervision from the central office upon them. In Boston the supervision of primary schools was taken from grammar masters in 1879⁵ and given to supervisors, but three years later it was restored.⁶ In St. Louis, three primary supervisors were appointed in 1898. However, they were not paid on a basis comparable with that of the principals of the larger schools, and Superintendent Soldan, in referring to their appointment, was careful to point out that their activities would not infringe on the authority of the principal:

¹Annual Report of the School Committee, 1903, op. cit., p. 52.

²Ibid.

³J. C. Morrison, "The Principalship Develops Supervisory Status," Tenth Yearbook, Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals, pp. 157-58. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1931.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1879, pp. 15-16.

⁵Ibid., p. 16.

⁶Ibid., 1882, p. 23.

"The same apprehension was expressed in regard to primary supervision which has been mentioned from time to time concerning supervision by the visiting superintendent, namely, that it might lead to a collision of authority and place the teacher in the disagreeable attitude of receiving contrary directions from her supervisor and her principal The whole system of management in our city rests on the idea of the responsibility of the principal for the condition of his school. There could be no such responsibility if the right of the principal to arrange all the details of his school were not conceded."¹

This responsibility for the full management of the school appeared to be strengthened by the pronouncements of superintendents and the rules of school boards as the years passed. In 1895, a by-law was adopted by the Board of Education in New York which made the principal the pedagogic as well as the administrative head of the school, and directed that teachers receive directions from him in all matters of instruction.² Superintendent Soldan in 1903 designated the principal as the chief supervisor of the school, and directed that all recommendations of assistant superintendents as to work in a school were to be made only after conference with the principal.³

The statement of Superintendent Blewett of St. Louis in 1910 is still cited as one of the most effective definitions ever written concerning the supervisory functions of the principal. Blewett discussed two possible conceptions of the relation of the supervisor to the principal. One conception considered the principal as holding the immediate responsibility for directing all the educational forces of the school, and making use of the supervisor as an expert to aid him in accomplishing his plans. Under this conception, the principal did not regard the supervisor as one who usurped his office, nor did he attempt to unload responsibility upon the supervisor. The other conception assigned to the Superintendent and corps of supervisors all that was vital in the educating process, and left the principal the empty husks of routine organization and accounting. Blewett described the difference between the two conceptions in the following forceful passage:

¹Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1898, pp. 153-54.

²Fifty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1895, p. 124.

³Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1903, p. 235.

"The efficiencies of two principals holding these opposite views are as wide apart as the poles. The one is an energy that draws into itself power from all sources, converts this power to its special needs and distributes it through every phase of school life. It brings to each teacher in the school the experience of her fellow-teachers transmuted by the larger experience and broader view that is most helpful. It reaches each pupil, through his sense of the masterful mind manifesting itself in every ideal, plan, and activity of the school as a stimulating guiding force. The other is the power of a wound-up spring or the dead pull of gravity. It has no force at any time that is its own and ceases to manifest itself in any way except through tortion applied from other sources. It has no capacity for transmutation, no life-giving or distributing principle. The first energy is the soul of a social institution. The second is the inertia of an unthinking machine."¹

A Period of Professional Reaction

The principals were slow individually and as a group, to take advantage of the opportunities for professional leadership which were granted them. This tendency was especially marked during the period 1895-1910. The principalship was well established from an administrative point of view, and at that point, principals appeared content to rest. Except for sporadic cases, they did little to study their work, experiment with administrative procedures, or publish articles on local administration and supervision. The large body of them were satisfied to attend to clerical and petty routine, administering their schools on a policy of laissez faire. They were generally entrenched behind their tenure rights, and they usually hesitated to show vigorous leadership to their teachers who naturally were often as reactionary, professionally, as the principals themselves. They were content to use "rule of thumb" procedures in dealing with supervision of instruction. Principals' associations, for the most part, were concerned with administrative phases of the principal's work, or with welfare features of the position, though there were instances where these organizations were of considerable assistance in constructing and revising courses of study.²

¹Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1910, p. 216.

²Forty-ninth Report of the Board of Education of Chicago 1903, p. 54.

Signs of emergence from reaction began to appear during the early part of the second decade of the new century. In 1916, a general supervisor in St. Louis, in characterizing the work of principals, classified them in three groups. The first group realized that their most important duty was to look after the work of the teachers with the children, to give all children the best possible opportunities for development, to establish unity in the child's training, and to raise the standard of all classwork to the highest possible level by well-planned supervision. Such principals did most of their clerical work outside of school hours. Principals of the second class insisted upon having good work in their schools. They usually gave much time to the help of young or weak teachers, but they did not exercise systematic supervision of all work throughout the schools. Consequently, the work lacked unity. They had good ideas as to how school work should be done, but secured it only in rooms where teachers "took to it." What these principals knew was fundamentally good could not be found consistently throughout their schools. The third class of principals, according to the general supervisor, appeared to think that all details of clerical and routine work must be done during school hours. Most of their time was spent in the office, little time being available for supervision. What good work was done in the school was chiefly due to the efforts of good teachers. Weak places in the school were not sufficiently looked after, and a general lack of co-operation was evident in the work of teachers and principal.¹

The Period of Professional Leadership

The large factor in the development of the modern principalship occurred in 1920, when, under the guidance of the Department of Education of the University of Chicago, a national organization of elementary school principals was founded.² The new organization was strengthened by affiliation with the National Education Association. The influence of this department on the making of the modern principal can hardly be over-estimated. It turned the attention of the principal to the scientific study of the problems of his position. It stimulated the professional interests not only of individual principals, but also of principals' associations throughout the country. The position of the

¹Sixty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1916, pp. 273-75.

²J. C. Morrison, op. cit., p. 160.

principalship became a topic of study in the departments of education of universities, and courses, and even programs, for the training of principals began to appear in the offerings of professional schools.¹ Studies made by principals regarding significant aspects of their work appeared in professional magazines and in the published reports of city superintendents. The following quotation illustrates types of activities which were engaging the attention of principals:

"Two typical problems submitted to the Division of Tests and Measurements by school principals are briefly stated here to illustrate some undertakings which are welcomed and encouraged.

"1. One school organized a primary class four years ago on the basis of mental tests. All of the brightest children were placed in a class together and kept together until they reached the fourth grade. Recently the principal sought to find out if these children have profited by this treatment. He wanted his opinion confirmed or refuted by facts. He consulted with the Division of Tests and Measurements concerning a technique for the study of this problem and secured suitable tests and measures of achievement for instrumental use in the investigation!

"2. The principal of another school, designated here as School 'A', found that the percentage of over-age pupils in his upper grades was very high. By comparing his own tables of age-grade distribution with those on page 43 of the Annual Statistical Report of the Superintendent of Instruction for 1922-23, he found that the retardation in his school exceeded average retardation for the whole city. Percents obtained from those tables, based on enrollment at the end of the year in grades IV to VIII inclusive, are stated in Table III

"The principal of School 'A' sought the assistance of the Division of Tests and Measurements in a complete survey of his school. He desired to ascertain the school's level of achievement grade by grade and to discover the level of mental ability. In the light of these two findings, and with the aid of certain other suggested approaches to the problem, he reached some valuable conclusions concerning the administration of his school."²

¹Announcements of the School of Education, University of Chicago, XXX, No. 7 (1930-31), 22.

²Sixty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1923, pp. 20-21.

The yearbooks published by the Departments of Elementary and Secondary School Principals provided especially effective media, and set high standards, for the publication of professional studies¹ and practices of principals. Thus, principals were at last aroused to a sense of their professional possibilities; the principalship finally began to assume true professional status.

Such a renaissance of professional interest could not fail to be reflected in the emphasis placed by the principal on the various aspects of his work. Studies made by principals on the division of time revealed what a large proportion of time the average principal was devoting to routine administration. Accordingly, more emphasis was placed on classroom supervision. Superintendents and assistant superintendents reported wider use by principals of the Dalton Plan, of silent reading to secure thought from the printed page, of socialized methods in conducting recitations. Intelligence tests and achievement tests were put to more effective uses. Visual instruction and supervised study were being effectively utilized. Superintendents noted that the supervision of principals was becoming more scientific, and their attitude more professional.²

The Principalship Today

It must not be inferred that the principalship in large cities is now on a complete, or even satisfactory, professional basis. Its professional potentialities have only been tapped, and the position as a whole, is in a state of flux. The brief digest presented in the foregoing pages indicates a gradual, though not always uniform, growth. In the subsequent chapters, the development of each outstanding characteristic of the principalship will be treated in detail. The following chapter will be devoted to the development of the principal's administrative duties.

¹See review in The Elementary School Journal, XXXII (December, 1931), 307-308.

²Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1927, pp. 22-23.

CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PRINCIPAL

Administrative Duties Defined

The number and complexity of the duties of the principal make concise classification difficult. A study reported in the Seventh Yearbook¹ of the Department of Elementary-School Principals shows that 897 duties were listed in the board rules of ninety-five cities. Of this total, 554, or approximately 62 per cent, were classified as administrative duties. Most studies² classify the duties of principals under five general heads: supervision, administration, clerical work, teaching, and miscellaneous responsibilities. However, school board rules frequently place emphasis on clerical duties,³ and studies based on board rules usually include accounting of plant equipment and repairs under clerical duties.⁴ The data of the present study are limited mainly to our largest cities. Here clerical assistance and modern office equipment are generally available, and responsibilities for plant equipment and repairs are usually delegated to the business department; consequently, clerical duties do not occupy a major role in the functions of the principal. Moreover, clerical functions are often closely interwoven with administrative duties. For the purposes of this study, therefore, clerical duties were included under the general head of administrative functions. The term "administrative responsibilities," as finally defined, includes general organization, pupil personnel, office organization, equipment and supplies, building and ground, and miscellaneous activities.

¹Seventh Yearbook, Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals, p. 216. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1928.

²The Principal Studies His Job. Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, p. 88. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1928.

³W. C. Reavis, P. R. Pierce, and E. H. Stullken. The Elementary School, p. 496. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.

Early School-Board Rules

Board regulations for the old Lancasterian types of schools contained provisions governing the administrative activities of principals. Rules for the East School house, Salem, Massachusetts, having "two male principals and six female assistants," showed discipline to be the sole administrative duty of the principals.

"The principals shall have the sole oversight of the scholars occupying desks in their respective schoolrooms, in respect to discipline. All misdemeanors occurring during the recitations shall be reported by the assistants to the principals, who shall thus have oversight of the delinquents; but misdemeanors occurring during reviews may be corrected, as the case shall require, by the principal who is at the time conducting the review."¹

Classification was prescribed as a duty for principals in Cincinnati as early as 1838. The "safe keeping of the school-houses and school furniture" and "to have them kept clean and in order"² were listed as duties the following year. The principal was also expected to give necessary instruction to his assistants, and "to regulate the schools under his charge." The statement, however, that many teachers are "so well acquainted with their duties and so faithful in their performance as to require little or no instructions from their principals,"³ testifies to the simplicity of the administration expected of the principal. In 1841, the principal's role in the examinations given by trustees consisted of seeing "that the bell was rung for each class to come and retire" and in 1847 the duty of ringing bells for recess was added. In 1848, the authority of the principal was extended to cover suspension of pupils for profane language or immoral conduct, and the prevention of pupils' leaving school without permission. The principal was also required to make reports on examinations of pupils who were candidates for higher schools. In defining the duties of principals in 1852, a special committee, after summarizing the foregoing provisions, reported as follows:

"It is also made his duty to report to the Trustees of the District as often as once each month, the progress of the several departments under his charge, noting the advancement

¹Fifth Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board of Education of Massachusetts, 1842, p. 132.

²Tenth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1839, p. 23.

³Ibid., p. 24.

and discipline of each department, and the cases of insubordination. It shall be his duty to report to the Board of Trustees monthly, the names of such Teachers as fail to comply with the resolution requiring them 'to open their rooms for the reception of pupils at least fifteen minutes in the morning and five minutes in the afternoon, before the regular time for beginning school.'¹

The by-laws of the school committee of Providence did not contain a separate list of duties of principals, but the following provisions indicate the nature of such duties as were prescribed for principal teachers: (1) They were to provide for the ringing of bells for a period of three to five minutes mornings and afternoons, (2) give any necessary directions to the other teachers respecting the welfare of the school, (3) turn over when absent the management of the school to the teacher who had the longest term of service in the school, (4) provide for recesses each half-day, (5) exclude pupils for gross misbehavior and notify in writing parents, chairman of the district subcommittee, and superintendent, of such action, (6) enroll all new pupils, (7) provide for roll call and accounting of attendance in all rooms, morning and afternoons, (8) provide for keeping records of birth and residence data for all pupils, (9) have record kept of behavior and progress of pupils, and report of same made to parents each month, (10) furnish visiting committee, after each quarterly examination, with names of pupils having outstanding records in conduct and progress, and names of pupils grossly negligent in attendance, behavior, or studies, (11) report to the Superintendent at the close of each quarter, the enrolment and average attendance of pupils, together with other pertinent information regarding the condition or welfare of the school, (12) employ a suitable person for making fires and supervise his work, (13) provide for, and supervise, the sweeping and periodic cleaning of school houses, (14) report each quarter regarding absence or tardiness of individual teachers, (15) furnish the Superintendent with names of indigent pupils, (16) keep a record of all books placed in their rooms for the use of teachers or lent to indigent pupils, and (17) make a quarterly report to the Superintendent on the number and condition of such books.²

Analysis of the foregoing regulations shows that of a total of 17 duties listed for the principals in Providence, ten,

¹Twenty-third Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1852, p. 110.

²Report on the Condition and Improvement of the Public Schools of Rhode Island, 1845, pp. 246-48.

or 58.8 per cent, were clerical in nature; four, or 23.5 per cent, pertained to organization; two, or 11.8 per cent, to care of school plant; and one, or 5.9 per cent, to pupil personnel. The duties listed for Cincinnati showed a total of thirteen, with four, or 31 per cent, classified under building and ground, three duties as clerical, three as organization, and three as pupil personnel. By 1848 two additional duties concerning pupil personnel had been added to the Providence list,¹ and by 1853, administrative duties for principals in Cincinnati² had been augmented by four responsibilities pertaining to office work, two to pupil personnel, two to building and grounds, and one to general organization.

When the nature of such regulations is analyzed, it becomes apparent that they were mostly based on expediency; that is, they were not formulated for the express purpose of improving the quality of the work of the school. The size of the schools was increasing and new duties were arising out of the fact that many teachers, and many pupils of various stages of progress were brought together in each building. Someone had to be made responsible for discharging economically and effectively the accumulating responsibilities. With the possible exception of classification -- which was mechanical and not to be compared with the scientific procedure of today -- the duties were general in nature, required no specific training, could be done in extra-school time, and probably could be performed as well by one teacher as by another. The administration of pupil personnel was limited chiefly to discipline, and school organization to prevention of conflicts in the class- and playground-schedules of the various pupil groups. Superintendent Wells of Chicago in his first report, described conditions which early administrative measures were designed to correct, as follows:

"The principals of the primary department, without exception, on account of the confusion created by the frequent filing in and out of the recitation rooms, the want of system, and a proper division of labor, did little except govern the pupils in the large rooms. And there having been no proper classification, and consequent division of labor, no individual responsibility was felt. The result can be as easily imagined as expressed."³

¹Report and Documents Relating to the Public Schools of Rhode Island, 1848, pp. 89-93.

²See the preceding chapter, pages 13-14, for a summary of principals' duties in 1853.

³First Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1854, p. 6.

The first regulations pertaining to principals published in Chicago,¹ Boston,² and St. Louis³ prescribed duties very similar to those of Cincinnati and Providence. Administrative activities of the principal were still in a very rudimentary stage of development.

Extension of Administrative Activities

The freeing of the principal from a portion of his teaching duties not only made classroom visitation by the principal possible, but paved the way, either directly or indirectly, for a marked extension of his main administrative activities. The policy gave him additional time for administrative work. Moreover, it resulted in providing him with assistants who relieved him of a large portion of his clerical responsibilities. Superintendent Wells in 1862 discussed this phase of the assistant's duties as follows:

"The other principal duty of the Head Assistant, is to collect and enter the general records of admissions and discharges, absences, tardiness, etc., under the general direction of the Principal. This duty usually occupies from one hour to one hour and a half a day. The remainder of the time is devoted to the examination of compositions, written abstracts and reviews, and other general duties.

"In Cincinnati, the Principals are relieved entirely from the charge of particular divisions or classes, and devote all their time to the general interests of the schools, including, however, the care of the general records, which are here mostly kept by the Head Assistants. In Boston, the duties of Principals and Head Assistants are similar to those of our own schools."⁴

There was a growing consciousness on the part of school authorities that simply meeting emergencies in local administration was not sufficient. Cities were growing with great rapidity, necessitating very large and often overcrowded schools. Superin-

¹Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1860, pp. 72-84.

²Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1857, pp. 274-94.

³Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1860, pp. xxxiii-iv (Appendix).

⁴Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1862, pp. 38-39.

tendents were now sentient to the need for improvement, but they were no longer able to give personal direction to local school staffs. Complex organization in local schools was often imperative; large numbers of pupils made systematic provisions for pupil accounting necessary; and in-service training was essential for large numbers of very young, untrained teachers. Realization of such demands led superintendents to request more free time, additional clerical assistance, and greater administrative authority for principals. Assistant Superintendent Seton of New York, in 1863, reported that observation of the difficulties of young and inexperienced teachers, arising from problem pupils, lack of suitable equipment, overcrowded classrooms, and faulty methods of ventilation, inevitably led to the conclusion that principals should be allowed abundant opportunity to visit classrooms. The young teachers, in Seton's estimation, would profit greatly by the constant counsel and guidance of principals on matters of classroom management, an opportunity denied them by the regulation requiring principals to teach classes.¹

Ten years later, Assistant Superintendent Jasper commented on the need for relieving principals of clerical routine by providing substitute teachers to act as clerks. He stated that the cause of the failure of inexperienced teachers was usually the failure of principals to visit classes and aid them by his presence and advice. The reason usually given for lack of such support by the principal was that his time had to be devoted to writing records, signing certificates, and making reports. Jasper believed that to have the person paid the highest salary in the school doing work which might be handled by the "merest tyro" was very poor economy.²

School authorities in Cleveland clearly recognized the problems facing the Superintendent due to the increase in the school population and attempted to meet them by establishing supervising principals. Four schools were placed under each principal thus appointed. It is worthy of note that superintendents and board members began to give attention, at the time, to the qualifications, as well as the responsibilities, of the principal. While the term "supervising" still referred largely to administrative activities, the nature of the responsibilities had broadened perceptibly beyond those prescribed for the principal

¹Twenty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1863, p. 120.

²Thirty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1873, p. 310.

in the "principal teacher" stage. President Perkins discussed the responsibilities of the position as follows:

"The duties of these Principals, though not so clearly defined as they might be, are the exercise of a general oversight of the methods of instruction employed, under the direction of the Superintendent; the settlement of cases of discipline; the rendering of needed information to parents and citizens; the establishing and enforcing of rules for the preservation of good order about the school buildings; the establishing of a proper classification in all grades, and the making of transfers from grade to grade. It will be readily seen that a wide range of duties is thus opened to the Principal, for the faithful performance of which no ordinary qualifications are sufficient."¹

The reports of superintendents during these years reveal that a considerable amount of study was being devoted to the status of the principalship. Frequent citations were made from reports of superintendents in other large cities and data from other cities were used to support local policies. In defending the policy of supervising principals, Superintendent Rickoff of Cleveland provided a clear picture of the administrative load in the schools of representative cities:

"In Boston, to each Grammar School there are several Primary Schools attached, and in consequence, the principal of the Grammar School being principal also of the Primary Schools, has the supervision of a larger number of teachers than in New York or Cincinnati. In Cincinnati, the number to each principal is from twelve to twenty-five, or in one case nearly thirty. In New York the number varies from eight or ten to thirty or thirty-five. In Boston the number runs from twenty to forty. The result of experience in Cincinnati is to the effect that the number of principals is greater than is necessary. It has been thought, indeed, by some cautious observers, that the number might be reduced one half. The question is yet to be determined, how many teachers may, judiciously, be placed under the direction of one principal."²

The establishment of supervising principals in Cleveland illustrates clearly the fact that economy policies of boards of education, as well as professional policies of the superintendent, often influenced the development of the principalship. The

¹Thirty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1868, p. 11.

²Ibid., pp. 49-50.

supervising principalship resulted from consolidating grammar schools, first from eleven schools to eight, and later dividing the schools of the city in four "grand divisions." A supervising principal was placed over all the schools in each of these divisions. Superintendent Rickoff argued that the arrangement was far less expensive than the old organization. He estimated that four supervising principals at \$1800 each, and four women as head assistants at \$1000, would make a total outlay of \$11,200, as compared with eleven principals at \$1500, totaling \$16,500, which would have to be expended for supervision under the old system.¹ Two years later, the number of supervising principals was reduced to two, virtually making them assistant superintendents. President Perkins utilized data from other cities to support the economy policies of the Board. Although the attendance in Cleveland schools at that time was far smaller than that of the other cities which he used for comparative purposes, and although he obviously had no grounds for assuming that results in Cleveland were less inefficient than in other cities, his data were doubtless regarded by his colleagues as convincing. The following excerpt from the President's report illustrates a type of reasoning not unlike that frequently utilized by members of present-day boards of education.

"The following table shows the cost of supervision in those of the principal cities of United States to whose reports we have had access, and whose schools have substantially the same rank as our own:

CITIES	AVERAGE ATTENDANCE	COST OF SUPERVISION
Boston	33,464	\$115,500
Chicago	24,839	43,800
Cincinnati	18,638	43,000
Cleveland	8,174	9,600
New York	103,243	333,900
St. Louis	16,277 [nearly]	45,000
San Francisco	16,382	33,800

"From the foregoing it will be seen that the supervision of our schools costs per scholar less than one-half as much as in Chicago, while there it costs much less than in either of the other cities named; nor are we able to discover that the work is performed any less efficiently here than elsewhere."²

¹Thirty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1869, p. 51.

²Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1871, pp. 11-12.

Another important step in extending the administrative responsibilities of principals was taken in Boston in 1866, when the School Committee recommended that the grammar school masters be relieved of their remaining duties connected with the teaching of their graduating classes -- duties which they were very reluctant to relinquish -- and that they devote their time not only to directing the work of the grammar schools, but to the primary schools in their district as well. Prior to this time the master's relation to the other rooms of the grammar school had been largely perfunctory; the rules required him to visit primary schools only once yearly and to examine the pupils of the graduating class. The new proposal was to make the masters real heads of both grammar and primary departments -- "acting, in fact, as principals" of the schools:

"Your Committee would recommend that the principles already recognized, of certain duties on the part of the Grammar master to visit and examine be enlarged and perfected, by its being made his duty, not only to examine the graduating pupils, but all the pupils; and not limiting himself to an annual visit, he shall visit as often as the good of the school and the improvement of the scholars shall seem to require."¹

The regulation, as finally passed by the School Board, read as follows:

"Section 3. - The Masters of the Grammar Schools shall perform the duties of Principal both in the Grammar and Primary Schools of their respective districts; apportioning their time among the various classes, in such manner as shall secure the best interests, as far as possible of each pupil throughout all the grades; under the direction of the District Committee."²

Growth of Prescribed Duties from 1853 to 1900

The rules and regulations published in the reports of boards of education in Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, New York City, and St. Louis, show that, during the period 1853-1900, 79 administrative duties other than those previously cited were prescribed for principals. Of the 79 duties, 32, or 40.5 per cent, were concerned with organization and general management; 12, or 15.2 per cent, with equipment and supplies; 11, or 13.9 per

¹ Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1866,
p. 57.

² Ibid., p. 60.

cent, with office duties; 10, or 12.7 per cent, with pupil personnel; 6, or 7.6 per cent, with building and grounds; and 8, or 10.1 per cent, with miscellaneous activities.

Duties pertaining to organization.- When the foregoing data are compared with those previously cited regarding the rudimentary stage of the principalship, it is apparent that a gradual decrease had taken place in the proportion of new rules covering clerical work. Nearly 60 per cent of the duties prescribed for principals in Providence in 1848 were clerical in nature, as compared with 13.9 per cent for the cities enumerated, from 1853-1900. Moreover, seven of the eleven regulations concerning clerical duties were published before 1870, and nine prior to 1880.

Duties connected with organization, and general management of the school, on the other hand, showed a remarkable growth. The data indicated a growing conception, on the part of superintendents and board members, of the principal as the directing manager, rather than the presiding teacher, of the school. Twelve, or 37.5 per cent, of the 32 duties with respect to organization were concerned with school and class programs; eleven, or 34.4 per cent, with direction of, and assignment of special duties to, teachers; five, or 15.6 per cent, with the selection of teachers and their assignment to classes; two, or .6 per cent, with the instruction of teachers; and two, or .6 per cent, with citation to the superintendent of failure or insubordination of teachers.

One of the administrative duties here classified under organization, and found in the board rules of three cities, was regarded as of primary significance by grammar school principals. This was the right of the principal to graduate his own eighth grade pupils and admit them to high school, without examination or limitation by the high-school principal or the central office. This rule was adopted in Chicago in 1881 under Superintendent Howland. In reviewing the effects of the rule some years later, Assistant Superintendent Sabin wrote as follows:

"This act was the emancipation of the school principal. It magnified the principal's office, giving to it a power, a dignity, a responsibility, and a freedom which Mr. Howland alone enjoyed during the twenty years of his principalship."¹ Howland, however, writing three years after the passing of the regulation, revealed that the exaltation of the principal's office was not the sole motive for the introduction of the policy:

"One of the most valuable results of admitting pupils to the High School upon the recommendation of the Principals of

¹Thirty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1893, p. 75.

Grammar Schools has been the loosening of these bonds, and allowing more freedom of life and action, more regard for the pupil's needs.

"With few or none of the evils which many feared, it has resulted in an advance along the whole line, largely freeing teachers from mere textbook recitation, and imparting a new life to their instruction. This is especially true in the higher grades, where the eye is no longer fixed solely on the coming examination, but upon the best modes of interesting the pupils, inducing a proper direction of their thought, a wiser development of their powers."¹

The number and variety of duties prescribed in board rules for the management of teachers were further evidence of the desire of superintendents and boards of education to increase the authority of the principal. Thus, the regulations include responsibilities, such as directing teachers during intermission as well as during school hours, assigning divisions and special duties to head assistants, assigning duties to a teacher when her class was dismissed, requesting explanations of teacher absences, and notices regarding time of return, requiring reasonable extra service of teachers outside of school hours, and assigning teachers to grades and rooms after they were assigned to the school. Some of the regulations bore evidence of concessions won by principals. A rule in force in Chicago as early as 1865, requiring that the principal be notified before a teacher was transferred, was of this type. On the other hand, a regulation in St. Louis in 1895, requiring that the principal confer with the Superintendent before moving a teacher from one room to another, though an exception to the general trend, suggested a concession to protesting teachers. However, not all the administrative duties relating to the management of teachers dealt with authority, for principals in Chicago were required to keep teachers enthusiastic regarding their work, and principals in St. Louis were requested to recommend promotions in rank and salary for teachers whose work warranted such action.

The principal's role in the selection and assignment of members of his staff, was becoming an issue toward the end of the century. A voice in the selection of new teachers for his school, a limitation of the freedom of teachers to transfer from school to school as they chose, and the right to assign teachers to such grades and rooms as he deemed best within his school, were prerogatives for which the principal zealously strove. New York was

¹Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1884, pp. 50-51.

one of the first cities to make marked concessions to principals with respect to selection of new teachers. The policy was stated in 1899 as follows:

"No young teacher can be appointed to any school until after a time of probation, nor without the unequivocal recommendation of the principal. Every principal knows how much his success and official comfort depends on the selection of good teachers, and he is not likely to recommend an appointment unless he can safely do so."¹

In Chicago, the principal was authorized, as early as 1865, to assign duties and divisions to the head assistant. The influence of ward committees in New York in this important function may be noted as late as 1899, when the following comparison of this policy with the more modern procedure of delegating the responsibility to the principal, appeared in the Superintendent's report:

"With regard to the assignment of teachers to work, there is a radical difference between Manhattan and Brooklyn. In the former borough, after a teacher has been appointed to a school, it becomes the duty of the principal to assign her to a grade or class; in the latter, the assignment is made by the local committee. In Manhattan, the assignment of teachers is made by those in the system who know most, in Brooklyn by those who know least, about the conditions of schools and the qualifications of teachers. The superiority of the Manhattan plan is obvious."²

Thus, the principal's right to give and enforce orders to his teachers, a large factor in making him the administrative head of his school, was well established by 1900. The relationship deemed fitting between principal and teacher at this time was effectively summarized by Superintendent Soldan of St. Louis, who pointed out that no school could be managed successfully without having someone in authority to advise, direct, and support teachers in their work. Authority was delegated to the principal by the Board to arrange all details of internal government of the school, subject only to the rules of the Board and the orders of his superiors. The teacher, Soldan continued, owed the principal loyalty, and friendly support. Her office was not that of critic, but of helper, and any professional order given by the principal should be carried out in a spirit of willingness, intelligence,

¹First Annual Report of the City Superintendent of the City of New York, 1899, p. 117.

²Ibid.

and helpfulness. The teacher always had the right to a frank discussion with the principal regarding affairs of the school as far as they concerned her, but such discussion was always to be approached in a friendly spirit. The professional reputation of the principal should at all times be upheld by teachers, according to Soldan, since the standing of the school in the community depended on it.¹

Equipment and supplies.- Responsibilities regarding equipment and supplies, scarcely mentioned in the first regulations prescribed by boards of education, ranked next to organization in development during the period 1853-1900. Of the 12 new regulations appearing under this category, 7, or 58.3 per cent, were concerned with textbooks. As early as 1860, Cincinnati had a regulation requiring principals to see that publishers exchanged textbooks in accordance with Board rules. Another regulation adopted the same year forbade any teacher "to introduce textbooks of a higher grade" into his or her class without the consent of the principal. One of the duties of a Chicago principal in 1865 was to report to the superintendent if two or more editions of a textbook appeared in his school. However, regulations such as those of New York in 1883 mark the real beginnings of the responsibilities of the principal with respect to textbooks:

"When books or any other supplies are needed, the Principal of a Department enters an order for them in the Pass Book of the Department, and submits it to the Board of Trustees of the Ward. If they approve the order, it is signed by the proper authority, and is sent as a requisition to the Depository, which is under the control of the Committee on Supplies.

"Other and stringent restrictions are here met. In December of each year, every Principal of a Department makes and submits to the Board an accurate inventory of all books and other supplies belonging to that Department including those in the hands of the pupils. A special tariff of supplies forms a part of the by-laws of the Board. By this, the maximum number of each and every kind of book allowed to every one hundred pupils for a year is assigned. Requisitions in excess of the tariff allowances are stricken out. At the end of the year, a table of the expenses, per scholar, for the average annual attendance of each Department is carefully made out, and all Principals whose total requisitions have exceeded

¹Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1898, pp. 78-79.

a certain average per scholar, are cited to appear before the committee to explain the excess.

"To secure the utmost economy, Principals are required to have all books in the hands of the pupils carefully inspected at frequently recurring intervals. The condition of each book, when intrusted to the pupil, is recorded on the inside of the cover. The utmost practicable care and neatness are insisted upon. Whenever the condition and character of the book justify it, it is strongly and cheaply re-bound. . . .

"With few exceptions, the Principals of these schools have shown good judgment in choosing books adapted to the several grades in their schools. Occasionally, however, classes are found where neither the character of the books nor the grade of the reading lessons in them is adapted to the pupils that are required to use them. The Principal of the school is responsible for these matters, as a part of the duties connected with the general management of the school."¹

The placing of the selection and ordering of textbooks in the hands of the principal was another indication of the extent to which he had extended his influence (or authority) over the entire school.

Pupil personnel.- Four of the ten regulations with respect to pupil personnel which appeared from 1853 to 1900, dealt with classification. New York, in 1870, required semi-annual promotions, and in 1891, prescribed the use of knowledge of the pupil's proficiency during the term, as well as examination results, in making promotions.² Three regulations were concerned with truancy, all in connection with truancy laws introduced during the seventies. One regulation required that the principal keep a "healthy moral tone in the schools." Only one new rule dealt with corporal punishment.

Building and ground.- No marked change was noticeable in the regulations pertaining to building and ground. Four of the six regulations noted were concerned with oversight or rating of janitors work. Such terms as "business agent," "supply agent," and "engineer" appeared toward the close of the period, foreshadowing future relief of the principal from many of the responsibilities connected with the care of the school plant.

Miscellaneous.- Regulations classified as miscellaneous gave further evidence of the widening sphere of the principal's

¹Forty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1883, pp. 149-50.

²Fiftieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1891, p. 114.

influence and authority. Four, or 50 per cent, of the activities related to preservation of the health of pupils. Principals in Chicago were directed, in 1865, to refuse admittance to pupils not vaccinated, and, in 1872, to give personal attention to health and comfort of the pupils; principals in New York, in 1866, were instructed to advise and influence their schools on cleanliness; and principals in St. Louis, in 1895, were required to remove a pupil having a contagious disease from the school. The other miscellaneous administrative activities consisted of recommending candidates for teachers examinations (New York, 1862), arranging with parents for pupils to take outside music lessons and the like during school time (Cincinnati, 1853), holding monthly teachers' meetings on school time (Chicago, 1862), and directing Arbor Day celebrations (New York, 1891).

The principal established as the administrative head of his school.- The closing decades of the nineteenth century found the principal in large cities well established, not to say entrenched, as the recognized administrative head of his school. He gave orders, and enforced them. He directed, advised, and instructed teachers. He classified pupils, disciplined them, and enforced safeguards designed to protect their health and morals. He supervised and rated janitors. He requisitioned all educational, and frequently all maintenance, supplies. Parents sought his advice, and respected his regulations. Such supervisors, general and special, as visited his school usually made requests of teachers only with the consent, or through the medium, of the principal. Superintendent Howland of Chicago, in discussing the principal's responsibilities stated:

"The prime factor in the success of individual schools is the Principal, and no amount of itinerant supervision can supply his place. Through him largely must the General Superintendent act upon the schools. He only can efficiently supervise the work of the school room, correcting errors and devising methods for securing better results. He should be familiar with the discipline, instruction, and personal influence of every teacher in his school, and with the results of her efforts

"Any authority coming in to supercede him in the direct management of his school, in the examination of pupils or the arrangement of classes, must depreciate his influence and lend to the injury of the school."¹

¹Thirtieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 57-58.

Administrative Duties from 1900 to 1933

Selection of new teachers.- The right of the principal to select teachers to fill vacancies in his staff continued to be a matter of concern to principals, superintendents, and teachers. As already noted, principals gained some important early victories in this particular; however, they encountered difficulties in maintaining these gains and in meeting new problems of a similar nature. Factors, such as extreme social changes in residential districts, opening of new schools, and increasing distances for teachers to travel, tended to make teacher turnover a serious problem for many principals. Maintaining a stable staff was especially difficult for principals of schools located in decadent parts of the city. Young teachers sent to poor residential sections often sought transfer to schools nearer home very shortly after accepting assignment. One method of helping the principal build up a permanent staff was to assign him cadets or substitutes who had received training in his school, and to eliminate cadets whose work proved unsatisfactory. The following regulation was typical:

"Cadets when assigned to a school shall be on trial for two months, after which time, if their work has been pronounced unsatisfactory by the principal, they shall be transferred to another school where they shall have a like trial for two months. But if after a second trial of two months the work of such cadets shall be reported unsatisfactory by the principal, it shall be the duty of the Superintendent of Schools to report the names of such cadets to the Committee on School Management for dismissal. Whenever a principal shall report favorably upon the work of a cadet such report shall be considered an expression of willingness to have such cadet assigned to his school as a teacher."¹

Usually, however, the assignment of a new teacher depended on whether there were teachers desiring to be transferred to the school in question. The following passage illustrates the procedure adopted in Chicago in 1903 with reference to transfers:

"Whenever a vacancy occurs in any school, the principal shall report to the Superintendent, stating the cause of the vacancy, the grade to be filled, and whether the vacancy is permanent or temporary. If permanent, the vacancy shall be filled, as follows: First- by the transfer of a supernumary teacher or a teacher on probation, in case there is such a teacher suitable for the grade. Second- if not filled by a

¹Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1901, p. 2.

supernumary teacher or teacher on probation, the Superintendent shall cause the transfer list for the school in which the vacancy occurs to be examined, and the first applicant then on the list in order of time, suitable for the grade, shall be transferred to the vacancy unless reasonable objections in writing are filed by the principal of the school in which the vacancy occurs, or by the District Superintendent."¹

A safeguard against transfer immediately after assignment was the provision that a teacher having been assigned to and having accepted a position, could not be transferred during the current school year, except for the good of the service.²

The procedure governing transfers in New York at this time was more restricted, placed more responsibility on the teacher, and appeared to give greater consideration to the needs of the school system. It was described in the report of Associate Superintendent Davis as follows:

"Transfers of teachers from one school to another are generally made upon the application of the teachers concerned. They do not involve any change in salary, such applications being usually inspired by the desire of teachers to be placed in schools nearer their homes, to their wish to secure opportunities for more advanced work and, not infrequently, to obtain easier work. These applications are required to be made on a specially prepared blank which, besides stating the nature of the transfer desired, gives a brief history of the applicant's former assignments, the grades taught, the salary received, together with a statement of the reasons for desiring to make the change proposed. The teacher is also required to obtain the signature of her District Superintendent and of her principal, either in approval or disapproval of her application. In case either of these officers disapproves, the reasons for the disapproval must be stated in writing. The Board of Superintendents carefully considers each of these applications and recommends to the Board of Education such transfers as, in its opinion, should receive favorable action. While numerous requests of this kind are received annually, many of them are of necessity denied, in order that the efficiency of the schools may not be impaired by too frequent changes in their teaching corps."³

¹Ibid., 1903, p. 83.

²Ibid.

³Sixth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1904, p. 158.

Little change in method of transfer of teachers in either Chicago or New York was indicated by later provisions, with the exception that in New York, in 1908, the signature of the principal to whose school the teacher requested transfer, was also required.¹ That the promulgation of regulations specifying the procedure for effecting transfers did not fully settle the problem, however much it may have simplified it, was evidenced by the following discussion of Associate Superintendent Edson of New York, in 1913:

"It is the policy of the Board of Superintendents to grant any reasonable request for transfer, providing the principals and district superintendent interested consent. At times a transfer is granted even when a principal objects to the loss of a good teacher, and a transfer sometimes is made 'for the good of the service' even when a teacher objects.

"Some of the principals, especially those in the lower East Side schools, Manhattan -- where a large proportion of the teachers come from a distance -- object strenuously to the frequent transfers on the ground that this constant upset of classes is detrimental to the best interests of the pupils.

"The plea that a teacher who is obliged to travel from one to two hours each way to and from school, and as a consequence is not in physical condition to do her best work, must be met by considerate action on a request for a transfer when a favorable opportunity is presented."²

New York, as previously noted, began early to give the principal latitude in the selection of new teachers, even after regulations placed certain limitations on choice from eligible lists. For example, even though selection was confined to the three highest candidates on the eligible lists, principals were urged to consult the lists in advance, to interview desirable candidates, and to avail themselves of every opportunity to secure good assignments.³

Principals frequently asked to have vacancies held open for a time in order to secure substitutes who were in charge of the classes, in which vacancies occurred. The attitude of the Board of Superintendents in New York regarding this policy was expressed as follows:

¹Tenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1908, p. 267.

²Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1913, p. 223.

³Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1911, p. 177.

"While the good of the school seems to indicate that at times a vacancy should be held open, yet those on the eligible list have a technical claim to appointment when vacancies occur, a claim that the Committee recognizes as far as possible."¹

Principals were likewise given as much latitude as possible in selecting their assistants. One assistant was allowed for each school having twenty-eight or more classes, and two for each school having forty-eight or more classes.² A principal was entitled to a seat and a vote on the Board of Superintendents in New York whenever appointments of Assistants or teachers for his school were being made.

When principals were compelled to accept from certified lists candidates concerning whose work they had no previous knowledge, they demanded the right to reject the candidates if, after a trial, their services proved unsatisfactory. In Chicago, the principal was allowed to request the withdrawal of a candidate within the first week of service if her work proved unsatisfactory.³ Principals in St. Louis were also permitted to reject unsatisfactory candidates. Primary Supervisor Gecks reported in 1915 regarding the effect of this policy as follows:

"Principals are more exacting with teachers than they could afford to be some years ago, and are not willing to keep, or appoint, a substitute in their schools unless she measures up to certain requirements in personality and training."⁴

Evidence that the principal's role in the selection of his staff has not been concisely determined even at a comparatively recent date, is furnished by the following passage in the report in 1930 of District Superintendent Grady of New York:

"I am sure that the principals would welcome the issuance by the Division of Transfer and Assignment of a formal statement of the policies followed in connection with the transfer of teachers, the assignment of excesses, the retransfer of teachers who have been in excess, assignments to maternity leaves, and the use made of the blanks which call for the signature of the present principal and the district superin-

¹Fourteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1912, pp. 213-14.

²Ibid., p. 215.

³Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1902, p. 5.

⁴Sixty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1915, p. 38.

tendent. In several cases, the fact that both disapproved transfer applications did not prevent the transfers."¹

Assignment of teachers within the school.- The freedom of the principal in assigning teachers to the various grades within his school was hampered in some city systems by the allowance of special salaries, or bonuses to teachers in the upper grades of the school. A shift to one of these grades, consequently, assumed the nature of a promotion. In New York, where this condition existed, the principal and district superintendent were required to make written recommendations where increase of salary was involved, setting forth the candidate's experience and other qualifications. This recommendation was then passed upon by the board of superintendents.² Where no change of salary was involved, the board of superintendents did not interfere with the principals' assignments unless a "manifest lack of good judgment was shown."³

The assignment of teachers has consistently been one of the most exacting administrative duties of the principal. Superintendent Maxwell, in 1904, stated in a bulletin to principals:

"Upon the proper assignment of teachers to duty, as much as any other one thing, depends the success or failure of a teacher's work. To this subject the best thought of the principal should be given. It is as great a test of executive ability and of principalship as any other element of supervisory work."⁴

However, the problem still appeared to be serious in 1926, as shown by the following passage from the superintendent's report:

"Careful attention should be given to the assignment of inexperienced teachers, of teachers who have recently returned from serious illness, and of teachers who are suffering from weakness or infirmity. Such teachers should be assigned to classes that do not require the expenditure of much nervous and physical energy. Newly appointed teachers should be assigned to classes in the second and third years, as far as possible, and should be given a considerable amount of sympathetic help. Particularly should they be trained in the art

¹Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1930, p. 376.

²Eleventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1909, p. 314.

³Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 223-24.

⁴Sixth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 155.

of questioning, in the power to interest, and also in the ability to modulate their voices."¹

The principal's role in local school organization.- Dissatisfaction with lockstep methods which resulted from stereotyped methods of classification and overcrowding of buildings, led to experimentation with various types of local organization. One of the first of these was departmentalization of work in the upper grades of the elementary school. Superintendent Maxwell advocated the gradual introduction of departmental teaching in New York in 1899, and stated that experiments conducted by several principals at his request, justified the policy.² Superintendent Cooley in 1905 published several sample programs of departmental organization in Chicago schools, with accompanying explanatory reports.³ In 1913, Assistant Superintendent Rathmann of St. Louis reported that five schools in his district were utilizing departmental instruction in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades, and in none of the schools so organized were the principals desirous of discontinuing it.⁴ Departmental teaching of drawing, music, and sewing in Grades IV-VI, as a means of improving results in these subjects, was advocated to New York principals in 1926.⁵

Multiple systems of grading, and the division of pupils into slow, medium, and fast groups were also subjects of experiment by principals in attempting better to fit the work to pupils. Associate Superintendent Straubenmüller of New York, in commenting on the comprehensive report of an experiment in a triple system of grading submitted by one of his principals, wrote as follows:

"I desire to say that to Mr. Goldwassers is due the credit for the apparent success of the classes, because of the zeal, industry, and intelligence displayed by him not only in the reorganization of his school but also in the preparation of the minimum course of study."⁶

Superintendent McAndrew discussed trial of the platoon plan in

¹Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1926, p. 23.

²First Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit.,
p. 119.

³Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1905, pp. 170-71.

⁴Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1913, p. 42.

⁵Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 263.

⁶Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 239.

Chicago in 1925, as follows:

"The principals trying it are level-headed school managers who are to be allowed to work out their experiment safe from hullabaloo."¹

Other procedures of principals to meet the individual needs of pupils appeared during the first decades of the present century. In 1907, Superintendent Cooley called attention to the fact that Chicago principals should co-operate more generally in making semi-annual promotions, in the eighth-grade, since the policy was adopted, years before, on the recommendation of principals.² New York principals had authority in 1908 to organize over-age classes,³ and in 1912, freedom to group pupils according to ability and arrange the course of study to fit such groups. In 1910, a principal reported on the organization of an open-window room in Chicago;⁴ in 1913, principals of St. Louis were permitted to open ungraded rooms;⁵ and in 1930, an account of an experiment of a New York principal with a class of pupils of low I.Q. was included in the report of a district superintendent.⁶

Policies adopted by principals to meet the problem of overcrowding were formation of half-day divisions (Chicago, 1908), and use of certain classrooms over an extended school day (New York, 1913).

Special responsibilities relating to organization.- In 1908, principals in Chicago were required by the President of the Board of Education to fill out a questionnaire on the management of their schools; in 1912, principals in New York were reminded that they were free to adopt the courses of study to meet community needs; in 1916, principals in St. Louis were advised to take stock of each year's work in order to organize efficiently for the coming year; in 1925, principals in Chicago were instructed as school managers to have a fully planned program for each day; in 1926, principals in New York were commended for devising plans for uni-

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1925, p. 70.

²Fifty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1907, pp. 134-35.

³Tenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 168.

⁴Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1910, p. 115.

⁵Fifty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 42.

⁶Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 350-51.

fied and economical class routine and for administering their time schedules effectively; and in 1927, principals in St. Louis were advised that they were responsible for effectively utilizing all available facilities designed to benefit school work.

Other responsibilities of principals related to organization were the calling and placing of substitutes (St. Louis, 1909), the determination, and evaluation, of work done by pupils in summer schools (Chicago, 1913), the management of baths, libraries, and teachers' leaves (Chicago, 1925), co-operation with superintendents in determining standards for rating schools (New York, 1930). New policies with respect to organization enunciated by superintendents were that principals should not be required to administer a high school branch in their buildings (New York, 1913); that principals might profitably utilize teacher opinion in the formulation of school policies (Chicago, 1914); that a standard school should meet ten specific requirements (Chicago, 1925); and that principals should be utilized temporarily by the central office in special supervisory projects (St. Louis, 1927).

New duties connected with pupil personnel.- The responsibilities of principals with respect to administration of pupils after 1900, as revealed by board reports, were largely those connected with the enforcement of attendance, and the issuance of work permits under child labor laws. In 1904, Superintendent Cooley reminded principals of their authority to suspend immediately pupils who participated in strikes.¹ In 1907, Chicago principals showed a decreasing tendency to punish pupils by suspending them, only 80 of the 292 boys sent to the Parental School having been previously suspended. Principals in Chicago were advised in 1903 that they had authority to issue school certificates, and in 1908 that they were authorized, under statute, to excuse pupils from attendance to meet work certificate provisions. New York principals were authorized, in 1909, to give examinations to pupils who wanted to qualify for school record certificates.

The attention given to atypical pupils brought a number of new responsibilities to principals. Among these were the sending of pupils to dispensaries, the selection of backward pupils to be examined as candidates for subnormal treatment (Chicago, 1907), and the maintaining of co-operative relations with visiting teachers (New York, 1930).

Office organization.- Recognition by school authorities of the principal's office as the "hub" of the school's activities was shown by provisions made in building plans for the office layout of the principal. Subsequent to 1915, provisions began to

¹Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1904, p. 151.

appear in building plans for special filing space, waiting room for pupils and patrons, places for special equipment, and accommodations for a clerk. The clerical duties which had early been delegated to assistants-to-the-principal grew more complex and burdensome and were gradually placed in the hands of clerks or teachers assigned to clerical work on teachers certificates.

New York, in 1904, had changed from a system of utilizing regularly assigned teachers to do clerical work, to assigning substitute teachers as clerks. Principals were allowed to nominate the candidates whom they wanted, such appointments being limited to five months.¹ This system gave general satisfaction. In 1908, Associate Superintendent Edson reported as follows regarding the clerical situation:

"There are comparatively few regular teachers performing clerical service, and this number is growing less from year to year. The substitution of a teacher with a substitute's license for a high salaried grade teacher as clerk is made as opportunity is presented. In nearly every school where regular grade teachers or assistants to principals now act as clerks, a change might be made at once at a great saving in expense and with but little, if any, disadvantage to the schools affected.

"The increase during the year of 114 teachers to do clerical service is due to a change in the by-laws whereby schools of forty-eight or more classes are allowed a second additional teacher. In these large schools the clerical duties are heavy, and these duties must be performed by low salaried clerks or by high salaried assistants to principals. These additional teachers also serve as substitute teachers in the absence of regular class teachers when other substitutes cannot be obtained readily."²

In Chicago, the Board of Education following several years of consideration, in 1909 established the position of "extra-teacher," allowing one such assistant for office work in each elementary school having twenty-five or more divisions. Superintendent Young, in commenting on this policy, wrote as follows:

"This has freed the principals and in most cases has enabled the person at the head of educational affairs in the school to be more closely identified with the work of educa-

¹Sixth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit.,
p. 161.

²Tenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit.,
p. 268.

tion than is possible when a large part of that person's time is occupied in keeping records, writing letters, and answering questions pertaining to minor affairs in the school.

. . . . The withdrawal of superintendents and principals to their offices tends to develop an ideal of school and school life that omits many of the most perplexing and interesting problems that arise. This withdrawal develops invariably a machine-like administration of school affairs, increasing the amount of work to be accomplished, and disregarding the fact that the power generated instead of being increased is diminished."¹

By 1913, New York had increased the allowance of clerks on the basis of school size, assigning one clerk to schools having from twelve to fifty-seven classes, two to schools having from fifty-eight to sixty-seven classes, and three to schools having sixty-eight, or more, classes.² In 1915, when the classes of schools in Chicago authorized to have clerks were reduced, Superintendent Young commented as follows:

"Because of financial conditions the clerks in schools having a membership of less than 1,400 have been removed for the remainder of the fiscal year. This will remand the principals to their offices and restrict their personal activities in furthering the advancement of the twenty and the ten per cent at the extremes of the school in each grade. Some principals will take home the routine work of the office and attend to it in the evening. They will do this willingly, and yet it is not for the good of the school. Something besides routine work should occupy the mind and time of principals in the evening, if they are to lead, encourage, and inspire a school."³

The clerks mentioned in the foregoing passage were eventually restored in the system, but in 1927, due to a court ruling, the teacher-clerks were replaced with civil service employees. The prevailing basis for assigning clerks, a part-time clerk for schools having less than thirty classes, and a full-time clerk for schools having thirty or more classes, was preserved. Studies reported in the Seventh Yearbook showed that in 1927, clerks in 17 cities over 100,000 were assigned on a median of 14.5 teachers,

¹Fifty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 93-94.

²Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 227-28.

³Sixty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1915, p. 30.

and in 8 cities, on a median of 950 pupils.¹

The increase of new educational activities in the school systems of large cities added to the amount of work to be done in the principal's office. This was especially true of responsibilities resulting from compulsory education laws, child labor laws,² special divisions, and special schools.³ In 1915, the use of tabulating machines was cited as reducing the work in offices of the principals of New York,⁴ and in 1925, Superintendent McAndrew reported that Chicago principals were protesting against elaborate reports on activities which were often temporary in nature. In 1925, principals in New York were requested to organize their work with the purpose of reducing telephone calls to the central office.

Equipment and supplies.- Additional routine duties with respect to equipment and supplies were delegated to principals in the opening years of the new century. In 1903, for example, principals in St. Louis were requested to preserve old books for collection, exercise proper supervision to preserve books, requisition all supplies, and receive duplicate receipts for supplies issued, keep a stock book showing books and supplies on hand, issue books and supplies to teachers, make a detailed semi-annual inventory of all stock on hand, and submit accounts and reports for checking by the auditor.⁵ However, principals strove mainly for a voice in the selection of, and method of distributing, supplies and equipment. Superintendent Cooley in 1905 commented as follows:

"It is suggested that principals and teachers make a careful study of the whole matter of furnishing supplies, with the object, first, of securing better methods of distributing and using supplies in the schools which have greatly exceeded the average in cost per pupil; and second, of forwarding to the Superintendent of Schools their suggestions concerning the system as a whole, with a view to its improvement."⁶

¹Seventh Yearbook, op. cit., pp. 262-63.

²Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1903, p. 48.

³Fifty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1912, p. 165.

⁴Seventeenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1915, p. 159.

⁵Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1903, pp. 71-74.

⁶Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1905, p. 193.

New York principals were criticized in 1905 for frequently using their allowances for textbooks "unwisely," by Associate Superintendent Edson. He advised them that if three hundred geographies were needed in a certain school, it would cost no more to get one hundred copies of each of three series than to get three hundred copies of one series.¹ In 1906, Chicago principals were authorized to requisition special geography materials from the Department of Geography in the central office,² and in 1907, they were permitted to collect money from pupils for the purchase of materials and tools to be used in manual training and construction work.³

A committee of St. Louis principals in 1909 made recommendations regarding changes in textbooks, which were adopted by the Board.⁴ Principals in Chicago were given increased responsibility in 1911 in connection with the running expenses of their schools, by dividing the money for educational supplies pro rata among the schools, and permitting the principals to order according to their needs. Later separate quotas per pupil were established for textbooks, supplementary books, maps, and work materials.⁵

Building and ground.- The rise of the business departments of boards of education either under the direction of an assistant superintendent or an officer co-ordinate with the superintendent, resulted in the principal's being relieved of most of the direct responsibility connected with heating, ventilating, and cleaning the school plant. This development was inevitable on account of the growth in size of school plants, the intricacy of modern heating and ventilating systems, and the growing demands of educational engineering on the part of the principal. Many principals in large cities, however, resented what they deemed the encroachment of the head-janitor, or engineer, on their administrative prerogatives. As a result, in many cities, regulations were issued specifically defining the responsibilities of principal and engineer. The following excerpts of the amended rules adopted in

¹Seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1905, p. 207.

²Fifty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1906, p. 110.

³Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1907, p. 288.

⁴Fifty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1909, p. 43.

⁵Superintendent's Bulletin, Chicago Public Schools, (January 22, 1931), p. 90.

Chicago in 1905 indicated a great departure from early board rules in which the principal was sole director of all activities connected with the care of the plant:

"Engineers and Janitors. General Duties.- Engineers and Janitors of school buildings shall have the sole charge of their school buildings out of school hours. Principals and engineers and janitors shall be furnished with keys to outside entrance doors and to pass key to inside doors of their respective buildings. They shall on no pretense part with the custody of keys of outside entrance doors to any person, without special permission from the business manager or the chief engineer.

"It shall be the duty of the business manager to provide and have set up in the office of each building, or in such other suitable and convenient place as he may designate, a keyboard, with a lock and two keys only, one key for the principal and one for the engineer or janitor. Principals, or in their absence the engineer or janitor, shall open the keyboards at the hour of eight o'clock a.m. in order that the teachers having charge of classrooms may obtain possession of the keys of their rooms for the admission of pupils. The keys are to be replaced on the keyboard by the teachers of the various rooms not later than four o'clock p.m., as provided in Sec. 157.

"Supervision of heating apparatus, etc.- The engineers and janitors shall have exclusive control of the heating apparatus, under the direction of the chief engineer, but they shall comply with the requirements of principals and teachers in respect to the temperature to be maintained, provided such requirements do not conflict with Sec. 229 of the Rules, or with any order given by the chief engineer.

"Under no circumstances is there to be any sweeping done while the schools are in session, except by permission of the principal of the school.

"Engineers not to leave heating apparatus.- During the season school buildings are required to be heated no engineer shall be required by a principal to leave his steam-heating apparatus to take charge of pupils in or about the school buildings or grounds.

"Engineers and janitors are expected to be respectful to principals and teachers at all times and to render such assistance as will not conflict with their duties as defined by rule.

"Principals and engineers and janitors will be required to comply with all requests and instructions emanating from

the office of the Architect, Business Manager, or Chief Engineer, relative to repairs, supplies, or other matters pertaining to their various departments."¹

The President of the Board of Education in Chicago, after a tour of inspection of schools in 1908, reported in part as follows:

"Derelict engineers and janitors were reminded of their duties. Principals were reminded that they were principals of their schools and responsible in a measure for their general condition."²

The President completed inspection of 240 schools a year later. After stating that the physical conditions of the schools were much improved, he continued:

"Only in a few instances it became necessary to cite the responsible engineer for trial on account of the filthy condition of the building. It may be remarked here that such a condition reflects as much on the efficiency of the principal as of the engineer; being constantly on the premises, it should not be for the president, or for the inspectors of the Board, to discover filth."³

In New York, principals apparently made themselves factors in the planning of buildings, as evidenced by the following statements in the 1926 report:

"That recommendations for the planning and equipment of school buildings should be complete and final. If a principal or director is to have a voice in the planning of the building, his views should be considered before the first set of recommendations is submitted. If a principal is selected after the planning of the building, he should accept the building as planned without assuming the role of a critic empowered to indicate how he would have planned and equipped the structure."⁴

Miscellaneous administrative activities.- A large number of responsibilities of the principal do not appear in rules and regulations of school boards, nor yet in the pronouncement of superintendents, but result from the creative efforts of the principals themselves. Most of the activities of this type reach

¹Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1905, pp. 197-99.

²Fifty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1908, p. 20.

³Fifty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1909, p. 25.

⁴Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 150.

the superintendent's annual report through the medium of the reports of assistant superintendents, or through the reports of principals themselves. The data of Table II are representative of activities inaugurated by principals from 1915 to 1930:

TABLE II

ACTIVITIES INITIATED BY PRINCIPALS FROM 1915 TO 1930

Activity	Year	City
Pupils clubs	1915	St. Louis
Supervision of playground activities at recess	1915	St. Louis
School newspaper	1915	St. Louis
Pupil activities for promoting courtesy	1925	Chicago
Safety patrols	1925	Chicago
Clean-up campaigns	1925	Chicago
Providing clothing and food for poor ..	1925	Chicago
Equipping schools with motion picture machines	1926	New York
Experimental work in character education	1928	New York
Radio instruction	1929	New York

Administrative duties recently prescribed by school boards.- The latest rules and regulations promulgated by the school boards of large cities tend to delegate large general functions rather than detailed specific duties to principals. For example, the duties delegated to principals in Chicago are contained in a single paragraph:

"Sec. 1 (Principals.) Principals of schools are responsible administrative heads of their respective schools, and are charged with the organization, supervision, and administration thereof. They shall establish and enforce such regulations, not contrary to the rules of the Board of Education or the regulations of the Superintendent as may in their judgment be necessary for the successful conduct of their schools."¹

The Board of Education in Cleveland has rules which are similar in form and content.² Boston delegates both broad general powers

¹Proceedings of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1933, p. 1021.

²Administrative Code of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1925, p. 25.

and detailed duties to principals of that city. The general powers are contained in the following passage:

"Principals of schools and districts and directors of departments are the responsible administrative heads of their respective schools, districts, or departments, and are charged with the organization thereof and with the supervision and direction of their subordinates and pupils, and with the general maintenance of order and discipline. They shall see that the rules and regulations of the School Committee, the directions of its officers, and the established course of study are observed; and they may establish and enforce such regulations not contrary to the general rules and regulations, orders of the school committee and instructions of the superintendent or of the assistant superintendent in charge, as may, in their opinion, be advisable for the successful conduct of their schools, districts, or departments. They may require their subordinates to keep such records and to make such reports as they deem necessary."¹

Specific regulations require that the principal shall "patiently hear and impartially investigate" all complaints from parents and others, and strive to redress real grievances; that he shall direct teachers and custodians in conducting fire drills; that he shall keep full records of all gifts made to his school and display no work of art not approved by the art commission.²

The regulations of the Board of Education of Baltimore regarding the duties of principals likewise contain both general and specific requirements. It is specified that principals shall promptly report school accidents, permit no one except general supervisors to interrupt teaching, give out no addresses of pupils to outside individuals, refrain from engaging the school in activities sponsored by outside agencies, and limit parent-teacher entertainments to nights preceding school holidays.³

The Attitude of the Superintendent

The extent of the principal's authority and influence depends more on the attitude of the superintendent than upon the wording of board rules. Two cities may have rules almost identical;

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1926, pp. 98-99.

²Ibid., pp. 99-103.

³Rules of the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore, 1929, pp. 20-25, and Supplement, 1930, p. 5.

yet in one city the principal may freely exercise administrative initiative, while in the other he may have all initiative dwarfed by the demands of a bureaucratic central office. A superintendent may change the whole policy of local school administrators by undue emphasis on a given phase of the school work, or he may stimulate creative administration of the highest type by encouraging the adaptation of each school to local needs. The following interpretation of the principal's functions by Superintendent Gerling of St. Louis illustrates the principle:

"The principal is regarded as the executive head of his school. He stands in the line of authority, and every element of local school control is exercised through him. Corollary to this fact the principal is the responsible agent in the school for all phases of management and instruction. It is the business of the principal to secure the best possible educational results and to do this with the utmost efficiency. All types of special service which are extended to the schools by the Board of Education are to be utilized in the school under his direction.

"St. Louis has long been known for the outstanding quality of the principals who have been placed in charge of the various schools. These principals have been selected for the most part, not only because they possess a high degree of training for their work, but because of the personal qualities which they possess for leadership in the field of education. The school principal in St. Louis is expected (1) to direct all supervisory activities in his school, (2) to utilize efficiently and economically all materials and service supplied by the Board of Education for educational purposes, (3) to find harmonious solutions for various problems growing out of community relations with the school, (4) to render accurate reports and keep accurate records, and to so organize and administer the school as to secure the best educational results."¹ General supervisors and teachers, as well as principals, soon sense the attitude of the superintendent when concisely expressed, and this attitude, in a large measure, is the deciding factor in determining the administrative responsibilities of the principal.

¹ Seventy-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1930, p. 23.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL

In dealing with the supervisory functions of the principal, the necessity for a practical definition of the term "supervisory" at once becomes apparent. The most common, and owing to its functional nature perhaps the best, definition is that supervision is the technique for improving teaching.¹ However, it is frequently difficult to distinguish between supervisory and administrative activities of principals; consequently it becomes necessary to list the activities which should be placed under the head "supervisory." The purpose of an activity is the determining factor in its classification. Testing, for example, is an administrative activity when used to classify a pupil newly entering a school, but it is a supervisory activity later when used by the principal in the classroom to diagnose the pupil's learning difficulties. The activities most commonly listed in studies of supervisory procedures are class observation, individual conferences with teachers, testing and measuring, demonstration teaching, pupil study and adjustment, and teachers' meetings.² The data here presented suggest six main supervisory activities: (1) classroom visitation, (2) teachers' meetings, (3) tests and measurements, (4) instruction in methods, (5) pupil adjustment, and (6) teacher rating.

Supervisory activities were first exercised in public schools by visiting committees of laymen, usually consisting of the "learned" men of the town, the ministers and physicians.³ Later, the duty fell on the selectmen. These committees not only visited the schools, but sampled the efficiency of instruction by examining the "scholars." After boards of education were

¹The Principal Studies His Job, Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, p. 92. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1928.

²Ibid., p. 94.

³Walter H. Small, Early New England Schools, p. 334. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1914.

established, schools were inspected, pupils examined, and teachers' methods directed by official school committees. As cities grew in size and the complexity of school organization increased, many of the supervisory functions developed by the visiting committee were delegated to the principal teacher of the school. This marked the advent of the principal as a supervisor.

Supervisory Activities of Principals Prior to 1900

Care must be observed in recording the first supervisory duties assigned to principal teachers by school trustees, in view of the fact that many terms used in early reports had meanings differing greatly from those they now possess. Classification was frequently mentioned in the first accounts of principals' activities, but it was concerned almost altogether with the organization of schools, and so must be classified as an administrative procedure. One of the earliest provisions dealing with supervision by principals appeared in the report of the School Committee of Cincinnati in 1841. It is significant that it bore the caption: Improvement in Teaching. It read as follows:

"Resolved, That the Teachers in the Common Schools of the City of Cincinnati, are hereby authorized to dismiss their respective schools one hour earlier on each and every Wednesday for practical improvement in the various studies, lessons, and qualifications appertaining to their professional duties; under the personal supervision of the principal Teachers of each house or district.

"Resolved, That the principal Teachers are requested, at the close of the quarter to furnish the Board with a written report as to the effects and probable results of this plan -- that if found to be useful it may be continued for a longer period."¹

Prior to 1841, a number of references were made in the board reports of Cincinnati to the growing difficulty of members of the Board to find time to attend properly to supervision of the schools. Some members resigned; and others threatened to do so,² because of the burdens connected with the school duties. The organization of a teachers' association was welcomed, because of the professional backing and advice that the board might receive from such an organization on the technical aspects of

¹Twelfth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1841, p. 51.

²Tenth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1839, pp. 11-12.

school work.¹ It should be noted that the meetings referred to in the foregoing passage were to be held on school time. The idea of freeing the principal for supervisory duties apparently had not at that time gained serious consideration, but the provision indicates the willingness of the members of the committee to turn over to the principal professional work which they were not qualified to do, and to provide school time in which to do it.

The earliest superintendents on assuming office at first failed to recognize the principal as the key to local supervision, but as has already been indicated, the rapid increase in the number and size of schools soon precluded effective supervision from the central office. Superintendent Wells, in his first discussion of supervision in 1855, failed to mention principals, but four years later he called attention to the necessity of freeing the principals of large schools in order that they might give part of their time to general supervision. Superintendent Guilford of Cincinnati during the period 1850 to 1853, gave little space in his reports to the supervisory activities of the principals. However, board regulations passed in 1856 specified that principals should devote at least one hour daily for every two hundred pupils, in attending to the general affairs of their schools. Among their duties were "supervising and directing the labors of their assistants," seeing that the pupils were "constantly and profitably employed during school hours," satisfying themselves, as often as once a month, by examination, "of the progress and thoroughness of each class" in all the departments of their schools, reporting to the trustees on the effectiveness of teachers, and co-operating with the superintendent "in advising and directing teachers as to the best modes of instruction."² Thus, by the middle of the Nineteenth Century, principals in Cincinnati had made beginnings in teachers' meetings, classroom visits, pupil adjustment, measurement of pupil progress, rating of teachers, and instruction in methods -- practically all of the modern supervisory functions.

Factors favorable to the increase of supervision by the principal accumulated rapidly in the third quarter of the Nineteenth Century. The grading of schools, installation of courses of study, and the introduction of new subjects, such as music, drawing, physiology, and physical education, required capable direction, and special assistance to teachers. The policy of freeing principals from a considerable portion of their teaching

¹Twelfth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 4.

²Thirty-first Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1860, p. 84.

duties, which was very generally adopted in large cities during the decade 1860-70, gave superintendents additional opportunity to utilize the principal in meeting the new and growing supervisory needs. Accordingly, the topic of supervisory functions of the principal assumed an increasing importance in the rules of boards of education, and in superintendents' reports.

In 1862, Superintendent Picard of Chicago listed visiting of rooms, examining classes, conducting model exercises, and supervising instruction, as certain of the activities of the principal during his free time, and expressed his confidence that the "satisfactory classification and instruction" then prevailing would be impossible without the supervision of the principal.¹ He secured passage by the Board of a provision permitting the principal to hold monthly teachers' meetings for the discussion of methods of instruction and discipline, and for discussion of the general interests of the school.² The following year, Superintendent Picard ascribed the progress he had observed in the schools of Cincinnati chiefly to the supervision of principals. He cited the devising of new methods and keeping abreast of improvements in other schools as activities of the Cincinnati principals -- evidence that creative supervision has roots reaching far back in our educational history.

That keen interest was shown in supervision by principals at the time was further attested by comments of other superintendents on practices in large school systems throughout the country. A committee from Boston, including the Mayor and Superintendent Philbrick, visited the schools of New York, and, in describing the activities of the principals of that city, stated that they had general supervision of the whole school, kept up a continual round of inspection, examined pupils in various classrooms, gave suggestions and directions to teachers, and moulded the instruction according to the extent of their ability and experience. It was furthermore the opinion of the committee that, in a position where the duties were so undefined, where so much was left to individual judgment, and where indolence and negligence might go so long unchecked, it was of the utmost importance to have as principals the right sort of men.³

Superintendent Harris of St. Louis was another who followed closely the supervisory practices of principals in other

¹Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1862, p. 37.

²Ibid., pp. 94-95.

³Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1867, p. 7.

cities. He was especially interested in the plan of placing the primary schools which were tributary to a grammar school under the supervision of the grammar-school principal. He cited the success which the plan had encountered in such cities as Boston, Chicago, and Cincinnati as an argument for adopting it in St. Louis.¹ That this extension of the supervisory sphere of the principal met with success in St. Louis is evidenced by a passage from the report of Superintendent Harris four years later:

"For three years I have had to report great progress in this direction. Our principals are rapidly becoming supervisors as well as instructors and the schools under their charge are becoming uniform in their degree of excellence. Close daily supervision is the only method of securing the desired result and one can scarcely believe how great a degree of efficiency may be reached in a corps of teachers of average ability, until he actually sees it as it exists in a large school under the management of a principal who knows how to perform his duty."²

As recent as 1910, Dr. Harris was quoted by Superintendent Blewett as stating that the supervising principalship did more to elevate instruction than all the other factors combined.³

The foregoing passages emphasized the desire of Superintendents for continuity of materials and methods of instruction in primary and grammar grades. At the time, oral instruction, object teaching, and uniform examinations were the order of the day,⁴ and principals were undoubtedly expected by general supervisors to put these procedures into practice throughout the school. A suggestion of lock-step standards was contained in a discussion by Associate Superintendent Calkins of the influence exercised by capable principals on the teaching in primary schools of New York. In his estimation, the principal was the greatest factor in the quality of work found in the classroom, justifying the saying, "as is the principal, so is the school." The principal should direct the work of the teachers "in unison"; he should know what each class was doing at any hour; and he should have all teachers

¹Fifteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1867, p. 133.

²Seventeenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1871, p. 188.

³Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1910, p. 144.

⁴Thirty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1868, pp. 41-47.

intelligently working "on the same general plan" and "accomplishing nearly the same excellent results." Principals should examine their classes more than the required "twice a year," and should not find it necessary to ask teachers about facts which every good principal should know about the work of the school, when visited by supervisors.¹

The training of new teachers presented a serious problem for the principal of the sixties. Often the sole source of supply was the graduating classes of the grammar schools, and teachers were frequently called upon to teach, without previous training or experience, in the very grades and rooms through which they had passed but a few years earlier. Superintendent Rickoff of Cleveland, in 1869, estimated that scarcely a dozen of the one hundred and seventy teachers of his force had had any professional training, and stated that regardless of natural endowment, they could not be expected to work together, or even carry through the courses of instruction, without daily supervision of principals.² Teacher turnover was rapid,³ moreover, increasing the constant recruitment necessary because of the steady growth of the school population.

Discussing teacher training in 1867, Superintendent Harding of Cincinnati recommended the establishment of a training department in a district school under the direction of the principal. Continuing, he stated that all of the schools were "training schools, in one sense" that the principals devoted their whole time to supervision and giving assistance to teachers, and that while some principals impressed themselves more effectively on their schools than others, all exerted themselves faithfully to secure "first-class instruction."⁴

Contacts of early principals with superintendents.- In almost all the large cities, superintendents held regular meetings with their principals, for the purpose of disseminating methods designed to improve instruction. In St. Louis, supervising principals were required to submit reports to the superintendent on each visit to tributary schools. They were expected to visit the schools once each week, to confer with the building principals, to observe general conditions, to examine classes, to determine

¹Twenty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 70-72.

²Thirty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 119.

³Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1871, p. 247.

⁴Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1867, pp. 22-23.

promotions of pupils, to observe the efficiency of teachers in discipline and instruction, and to report the date and amount of time consumed in each visit.¹ Superintendents usually visited each school several times during the year,² even in New York, Boston, and Chicago, where assistant superintendents were available.

The question of how much independence the principal should be allowed in initiating supervisory policies -- a question common to present-day school administration -- had an early origin. Superintendent Harris, in 1871, expressed a modern, as well as comprehensive, view on this absorbing topic, stating that

"there should be as much local freedom or independence given as is consistent with the attainment of the general object in view. A prescribed method which all must follow is liable to lead to a mechanical routine. To hold subordinate officers accountable for results, and leave them a wide scope in the choice of methods, has proved most effective in developing the strength of the whole.

"The guiding principle in defining the duties of the supervising principals is this: Local supervision should not be extended so far as to encroach on central supervision, that of the general superintendent, nor so far on the other hand as to relieve of responsibility the subordinate principals. An equilibrium of these interests must be preserved. It is obvious that unless there is harmony of action between these, there cannot result any good from the endeavor of the Superintendent. Independence in the proper sense of the term is to be achieved not through mutual limitation, but rather through mutual agreement and concert of action. All must carry out the same plan and that plan must be broad enough to comprehend the purposes of each."³

Continuing, Dr. Harris discussed another point on which general agreement does not exist today, namely, the question of whether the principal should do any teaching:

"It must not be forgotten that the nature of supervision of a principal differs, and should differ, in kind from that of the superintendent.

"The principal should be a teacher; should do some teaching each day. He looks at the work of his school from the

¹Seventeenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. xxviii (Appendix).

²Thirty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1885, p. 19.

³Seventeenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 189-90.

point of view of its minute details, while the superintendent sees more clearly its general results and their value compared with the standard of all the schools. By means of this two-fold supervision, each teacher's work is seen from two points of view. For this reason it will not gain the same end if we increase the corps of superintendents, nor if we make too few local superintendents -- for then they would have no time to do anything."¹

Supervising the materials of instruction.- New York had a course of study as early as 1854; Chicago, in 1861; and Cleveland in 1868. In 1860, principals in New York were criticized for trying to cover too much material in the lower grades, and not effectively utilizing the course of study.² In 1866, principals in St. Louis were advised to confer frequently with teachers on the "kind and amount of work" to be done, "as well as with respect to the best methods of instruction."³ A board regulation in New York in 1865 made it mandatory for the superintendent and his assistants to ascertain at each visitation of a school, whether provisions of the course of study were being followed, and to report to the Board any violation of the provisions, together with the name of the principal in whose school the violation occurred. Examinations were required by board rules and were given at stated periods. Their chief purpose undoubtedly was to remind the principal that the course of study was to be followed, and that the grading of the school was to be preserved. Time schedules for courses were in use as early as 1870.

Use of examinations to evaluate the principal's supervision.- The belief in the efficacy of examinations led school boards and superintendents not only to utilize this device in evaluating pupil ability, but in determining the ability of principals and teachers as well. The regulation of the Board in New York furnished an effective account of the factors considered in rating the supervision of the principal.

"Whenever the Superintendent of Schools shall deem it advisable to direct any school, or class therein, to be examined, it shall be the duty of the Principal of said School to provide him or his assistants with a statement showing the number of pupils taught in the class, the length of time in it, their

¹Ibid., p. 190.

²Nineteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1860, p. 43.

³Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1866, p. 45.

age, the studies pursued, the progress of the pupils therein, together with their advantages for intellectual improvement out of school; and this statement shall be furnished to the Superintendent or his Assistants as a means of enabling them, in their examination, to form an estimate of the progress made by the pupils; and further, each school shall be judged as to whether it has been conducted properly by the Principal, or taught satisfactorily by the teacher, solely by a careful consideration of the peculiar circumstances of the school or class under examination; and in determining the qualifications and duties performed by the class teachers, due consideration shall be given to the amount of advice, co-operation, or assistance given by the Principal to the teachers of said classes in their class duties."¹

In Cincinnati, an implied, rather than direct, use was made of the results of examinations in evaluating the work of the principal. The name of the school, the name of the principal, the names and averages of the class of each teacher, and the rank of each school were published. Disparities in the averages secured by the pupils of various teachers were discussed, and low ratings were attributed "serious defects in the teaching if not in the superintendence." The examination questions were sent, sealed, to the principal with explicit directions for administering, and the papers were marked by committees of principals, with the provision, however, that no principal might participate in marking papers from his own school.² The Board commended the principals for the time and energy they expended in making the examinations a success, but, unfortunately, no records are available of the private reactions of the principals to such stringent criteria and "pitiless publicity" of the results of their work. The concrete reactions of the principals of New York to the publicity feature of the examinations in their schools has been treated in a previous chapter.

Subject supervision by the principal.- The data concerning the supervision of various subjects of the curriculum by the principal during the last half of the Nineteenth Century are very meager, with the exception of those of New York City. The chief reason for the lack of data was that superintendents usually discussed theory, rather than supervision, of instruction when they

¹Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1868, pp. 26-27.

²Fifth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1872, pp. 43-49.

referred to subjects in their reports. Practically the only sources of information regarding subject supervision by principals were reports of associate and district superintendents of New York, and even these contain statements of what principals, in the opinion of the Superintendents, should do rather than what the principals themselves actually planned and practiced. An ideal source of material -- records or reports of principals concerning their activities -- was included but rarely in superintendent's reports.¹

Principals in New York were experimenting in 1870 with Leigh's Pronouncing Orthography, and in 1871, its use was permitted, at the option of the principals, in all the schools.² In the same year it was pointed out that principals should inspect reading books, select passages most appropriate to the age of the class and fitted "to cultivate a taste for useful reading," indicate the order in which the passages were to be read, and mark expressions needing explanation by the teacher, in order to eliminate "too prevalent profitless reading!"³ In 1874, the principal was advised to designate approximately the number of lessons to be read by a class in a given time, and not to permit this "to depend upon the caprice of the teacher."⁴ Progress in the amount of reading still was a problem for the assistant superintendents in New York in 1878. Complaint was made that there was no valid reason why the character of the primary reading should be "at best only stationary." Indication that thought-getting was receiving some emphasis appeared in the statement that if all principals of primary schools would give reading the same attention that many were giving it, "mechanical reading, which is nearly destitute of thought," would soon disappear.⁵

The construction of supplementary lists of familiar words for use in reading was cited in 1881 as an activity practiced by efficient principals and worthy of emulation by all principals.⁶

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1898, p. 119.

²Thirtieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 217.

³Ibid., pp. 214-15.

⁴Thirty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1874, p. 284.

⁵Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1878, p. 153.

⁶Fortieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1881, p. 142.

In 1886, principals in Chicago were praised for having made, through "personal efforts," "most excellent collections" of books for supplementary use in reading. It was stated that the Board had made beginnings in libraries, but that the effective use of the library depended on the principal.¹ In 1888, reading in the grades in Chicago was reported as "very gratifying" and it was stated that instructions given teachers as to the amount resulted in very perceptible improvement in that branch of study. Principals were instructed to make reading the basis of promotion to the second grade, without regard for spelling, numbers, or writing.²

Spelling received much attention in the latter decades of the century. Principals in 1873 were advised to make graded lists of spelling words for the use of their teachers; in 1879, to supervise the selection and number of words to be taken from reading lessons so that the lists would be properly graded; and in 1883, they were commended for having "impressed on their teachers the necessity of carefully reviewing the words taught in the preceding grades."³

Principals in New York were commended in 1884 for gains made in handwriting,⁴ and in 1890 they were authorized to determine the period, prior to "the beginning of the fourth half-year," at which writing with a pen might begin.⁵

In 1879, principals were reminded that they should supervise the detection and correction of pupils' errors in oral English,⁶ and in 1893, they were directed to consider ways of limiting the time devoted to technical grammar, and to utilize the time thus saved, for reading.⁷

An assistant superintendent recommended, in 1873, that a graded system of drawing be made obligatory on principals, for

¹Thirty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1886, p. 51.

²Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1888, p. 72.

³Forty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1883, p. 140.

⁴Forty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1884, p. 169.

⁵Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1890, p. 134.

⁶Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1879, p. 161.

⁷Fifty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1893, p. 135.

otherwise it would be "useless to look for satisfactory results."¹

Deficiencies in methods in arithmetic were charged to principals in New York as early as 1874. One of the phases of arithmetic which caused considerable concern to the principal's superior officers in 1882 was weights and measures. It still was a problem ten years later, when the superintendent quoted from the teachers' manual as follows:

"The fundamental instruction in these tables of measure is given in the higher Primary and lower Grammar grades. In the latter grades the class teachers are, for the most part, the youngest and least experienced, and they are, naturally, the most dependent upon the Principals for advice and direction; and a wise Principal will not make the mistake of taking it for granted that a knowledge of the several relations of measures expressed in a table proves a teacher's knowledge of the meaning and uses of the measures themselves. The fact that the teachers of these lower grades are constantly promoted to higher grades by reason of vacancies occurring above them imposes anew upon the several Principals the task of training up the newly appointed teachers; but the time spent in and the labor devoted to this work in the very lowest grade ought to bear good fruit in each succeeding grade to which those teachers may be transferred."²

In 1894, marked improvement in the teaching of arithmetic was credited to "effective supervision on the part of the principals."³ Principals in Boston made allowance for teachers' initiative in their supervision of arithmetic, according to the report of a general supervisor:

"The methods of teaching arithmetic in the grammar schools partake of the variety observed in other work. It is not usual for the principal, though he is responsible for the instruction, to prescribe methods of work. The teachers are allowed all the freedom that is consistent with the maintenance of a system of instruction, and occasionally even more."⁴

¹Thirty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1873, p. 311.

²Fifty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1892, pp. 132-33.

³Fifty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1894, p. 129.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1895, p. 147.

The data on the supervision of history and geography by the principal for the period are very meager, and are usually limited to discussions of checking on course of study requirements, seeing that teachers conducted reviews of materials of the previous grade,¹ and supplying classrooms with maps and globes.²

Analysis of the foregoing data indicates certain major trends in the supervision of academic subjects by the principal and his general supervisors. Considerable emphasis was placed on the grading of materials, a natural outcome of the grading of schools and mass methods necessitated by large schools and crowded classrooms. Progress in each subject, with the goals specifically set for each teacher to follow, was also stressed. Undoubtedly the prevalence of large numbers of new, untrained teachers made even moderately uniform progress in each grade a serious problem for the principal.

Creative supervisory projects of principals.- One of the brightest features of the principals' supervision during the period under discussion was the initiation of projects new to the system, in their schools. In almost all the cases where new projects, such as cooking classes,³ sewing instruction,⁴ manual training activities⁵ and the like were extensively discussed in the board reports, principals' descriptions of, and comments on, the projects were reported in full. Comprehensive reports by principals on such topics as the relation of the kindergarten to primary instruction,⁶ inventive projects, and constructive work in the elementary grades⁷ were included in the reports of superintendents. Principals were usually instrumental in interesting prominent citizens of large cities in the values of instruction in the new subjects, especially in the manual and domestic arts, with the result that often financial aid was forthcoming until

¹Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1876, p. 137.

²Forty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 168.

³Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1886, p. 53.

⁴Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1898, p. 58.

⁵Thirty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1893, pp. 112-16.

⁶Ibid., pp. 104-11.

⁷Forty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1899, p. 171.

the work was officially adopted by boards of education.¹ When the matter of enrichment of the upper grades of the grammar schools, following the Report of the Committee of Ten arose, principals in Boston were permitted to introduce enrichment in their own way and at their own convenience. Excerpts from their reports concerning experiments with algebra, geometry, French, and Latin in the upper grades were included in the Superintendent's report,² and the results of their procedures commended.³

Developments in general supervisory functions of the principal from 1875 to 1900.- In addition to subject supervision, certain new trends developed during the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century in the general supervisory status of the principal. The principal was already generally established as the key to local supervision in the large cities, both through regulations of school boards, and pronouncements of superintendents. His place in the superintendent's supervisory organization was known and respected by teachers, and special and general supervisors. However, the principal's supervisory technic was still in a rudimentary stage of development. One of his main supervisory duties was to train new teachers, but his methods of training them were of the apprenticeship type. He trained them largely "to keep" school, and to strive to attain approximately the same methods and progress as the older teachers. A "uniformity of excellence" throughout the school was a current standard for a principal to attain. Normal schools to train teachers for city systems were not yet making their influence felt, and professional literature was still limited in variety and output. Rumblings against mechanical procedure and lock-step progress were becoming audible, but the principal's supervision was deemed very effective if he kept his teachers uniformly covering the materials of the prescribed course of study, maintaining a militaristic type of discipline, and working in reasonable uniformity on methods disseminated from the central office.

Changing conditions, however, were destined to enlarge the sphere of the principal's supervisory activities. Cities continued to grow at a tremendous rate; compulsory attendance and child labor laws were enforced more rigorously; manufacturers became interested in trade courses in the upper grades of the elementary schools; and philanthropic citizens and welfare societies

¹Forty-fourth Annual Report, Chicago, op. cit., p. 58.

²Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1896, pp. 44-45.

³Ibid., 1895, p. 64.

became interested in special phases of child training. The introduction of new activities into the schools caused new problems for principals to study and solve. The work of Eliot and Harper tended to break up the hard and fast gradation of schools and introduce enrichment into the upper grades of the elementary school. The ideas of James, Parker, and Dewey were beginning to influence the methods of normal schools and to permeate the work in the primary classrooms. Such social and educational movements could not fail to influence superintendents -- conservative as most of them were -- and through them, the supervisory functions of the principal.

Classroom visitation.-- Prior to 1875, classroom visitation consisted primarily of checking on the teacher's activities. "Inspection" was the watchword, and such procedures as making daily rounds, and knowing what each class was doing at any hour, were recommended for the guidance of principals. Subsequent improvement was in the direction of making visitation more concrete. Philbrick pointed out in 1877 that

"Merely looking on and seeing teachers teach is not the supervision of instruction which is to be expected of a principal."¹

The influence cast by the principal over the school in his visits to classrooms and intercourse with pupils and teachers received considerable stress. The principal was expected to make the "influence of his personality" felt in "every corner of the school,"² and to be familiar with the personal influence of every teacher.³ He was expected, in his round of brief daily visits to each room, to participate, even if only by a few words, in the work, thus showing his interest and "making his presence felt."⁴ Not only individual teachers, but whole schools, it was stated, could be strengthened in purpose and performance "through the influence of a worthy, capable Principal."⁵ While the emphasis on the principal's influence doubtless served to eliminate much formality and uneasiness occasioned by his visits, it degenerated into the emotional, ineffective conception of visitation later

¹Ibid., 1877, p. 201.

²Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1898, pp. 82-84.

³Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1884, pp. 57-58.

⁴Forty-fourth Annual Report, St. Louis, op. cit., pp. 82-84.

⁵Thirty-fourth Annual Report, Chicago, op. cit., p. 70.

known as "casting a genial influence over the room."¹ Better indications of improving visitation were a broad regulation requiring the principal to keep notes on each visit to classrooms,² and the advice of a superintendent to principals to follow each room visit with a conference with the teacher.³

Conferences with teachers.- New activities added to meetings and conferences with teachers consisted of individual conferences following visits to classrooms (1892), the systematic study of pedagogic works by school staffs (1892), discussions by grade and departmental groups of instructional problems (1895), harmonizing and unifying the work of the school (1898), and demonstrations of teaching for the teachers of various grades (1900). Such procedures marked a great advance in broadening the purposes and increasing the usefulness of staff conferences and meetings.

Improving methods of instruction.- The principal gained greater freedom in determining the methods to be used in his school, and was intrusted with correspondingly greater responsibilities for results. He was considered the most important factor in the training of his teachers,⁴ and it was frequently pointed out that if young teachers failed to make good, the responsibility should be charged to him.⁵ The courses of study were followed rigidly with respect to content, but the principal was permitted a greater variety of methods in administering them.⁶ Where manuals of teaching methods were utilized, principals were sometimes instructed to consider the provisions of the manuals advisory, rather than mandatory.⁷ The policy of basing methods on correct educational principles was advocated frequently by the principal's general supervisors,⁸ and while there is little evidence that

¹L. D. Coffman, "The Control of Educational Progress Through School Supervision," Proceedings National Education Association, LV, 187. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1917.

²Fifty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1895, pp. 124-26.

³Fifty-first Annual Report, New York, op. cit., p. 123.

⁴Thirty-fourth Annual Report, Chicago, op. cit., p. 66.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1892, p. 34.

⁷Forty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1882, p. 10.

⁸Thirty-eighth Annual Report, Chicago, op. cit., p. 34; Forty-fourth Annual Report, St. Louis, op. cit., p. 84.

principals were either able, or disposed, to put it into practice, it at least marked the beginnings of a scientific attitude toward the principal's work. In 1895 school board regulations, under the caption "Supervisory Duties of Principals," designated the principals as responsible "pedagogic" heads of their schools.¹ Principals were generally expected to supervise the practice teaching of normal school students, aid their teachers to become skillful questioners, and "vitalize" instruction throughout their schools.

Tests and pupil adjustment.- The greatest advance made in testing during the period was the recognition that examinations were effective instruments for "shaping" instruction.² Special emphasis was placed on the principal's knowledge of individual pupils. He was expected to make contacts with them in the classroom, to be familiar with their characteristics and qualifications,³ and to utilize such knowledge in classifying and promoting them. While it is difficult to understand how principals could meet this expectation in view of the size of the schools at the time, the utilization of factors other than examinations in classification⁴ marked an early stage in attention to individual needs of pupils. This trend was further illustrated by the introduction of statements, in place of the traditional numerical marks, in the ratings of pupils and reports of progress to parents. It is illustrated by the following excerpt from the report of Superintendent Howland in 1886:

"I have requested the Principals to have the marking cards largely laid aside, and in their monthly reports to parents, to state in a few simple words, the character and standing of the pupil, giving no percentages, and permitting no pupil to know his percentage or rank in the class. Most of the Principals express themselves as in thorough accord with the suggestion."⁵

Rating of teachers.- Reports on the efficiency of substitute teachers was one of the earliest requirements made of principals in the matter of teacher rating. This activity which was prevalent as early as 1880,⁶ originated as a phase of the procedure for selecting new teachers. Principals were authorized to

¹Fifty-fourth Annual Report, New York, op. cit., pp. 124-26.

²Forty-fourth Annual Report, Chicago, op. cit., pp. 117-19.

³Forty-fourth Annual Report, St. Louis, op. cit., pp. 82-84.

⁴Thirty-eighth Annual Report, Chicago, op. cit., pp. 47-48.

⁵Thirty-second Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 47-48.

⁶Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1880, p. 69.

dismiss a substitute teacher in their schools whose work they judged inefficient,¹ and they were required to evaluate the efficiency of substitutes who were candidates for vacancies in their own schools.² In 1894, principals in St. Louis were required to make quarterly reports on the general efficiency of each teacher, and in 1898, to rate the efficiency of apprentice teachers assigned to their schools from the Normal School. Inspection and oral and written examinations were still the most common methods recommended to principals for determining the efficiency of teachers.³

Special aspects of supervision by principals.- The supervisory load of the principal underwent important changes in certain cities during closing decades of the century. In Boston, the grammar school principals, to whom the supervision of primary schools had been delegated in 1866, were relieved of the responsibility in 1879, and the primary schools were placed under the direction of supervisors. This change was due largely to dissatisfaction with the extra burden of supervising the work of the primary teachers. However, when the policy was reversed three years later, it was primarily to meet the urgent wishes of these same grammar principals. In 1888, the supervision of supervising principals in St. Louis was limited to their own schools. Maxwell stated in 1900 that New York had an excessive number of assistants-to-the-principal who did not teach, and estimated that each principal should be able to supervise the work of at least twenty teachers.⁴ Principals were usually permitted to delegate supervisory duties to free assistants. Pronouncements by superintendents of large cities left little doubt of the principal's strategical position in supervision. The following excerpt is one of the rare examples in which statements were purported to be based on factual data:

"One point brought out quite clearly by the examinations made by this department is the intimate connection between the Principals' work and the condition of the newer subjects in the several classes. In the schools in which the Principals spend a goodly portion of the time in class-rooms exemplifying their precepts by practical lessons in teaching,

¹Forty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1896, p. 31.

²Ibid.

³Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. xviii (Appendix).

⁴Second Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1900, p. 31.

the subjects in general have been found to be in a very good condition; but the best results have been found in those schools in which the work of the Principals in the classrooms was supplemented by regular conferences with their teachers."¹

Growth of Supervisory Functions of Principals
from 1900 to 1918

The first years of the period between the opening of the present century and the end of the second decade were marked by the extension of certain supervisory activities already practiced by principals, rather than by the addition of new ones. This was especially true of training young teachers, teachers' conferences, and the rating of the efficiency of teachers. Visitation and testing, on the other hand, received scant attention. Adjustment of materials for pupils was confined largely to departmentalization in the upper grades. Beginning about 1908, however, and continuing through 1913, the official literature contains an appreciable number of references to adapting materials and instruction to backward groups. Principals experimented considerably with such devices as double-track plans, special rooms for over-age pupils, and organization of whole schools to facilitate individualization of the pupils' work. Creative supervisory projects were the outstanding feature of the second decade of the period, and toward the close of the period evidences of the influence of standardized tests appeared.

One of the first new devices in methodology to be mentioned in this period was the plan-book. In 1902, principals in St. Louis were required to evaluate the lesson plans of apprentice teachers, and in 1903, the Board of Superintendents in New York felt constrained to characterize the time and energy spent by teachers in "writing out elaborate plan and progress books" as an unnecessary burden on teachers and a detriment to their work. They suggested instead that the principal should co-operate with teachers in making a monthly or term plan, subject to modification.² Principals were expected to make out programs for apprentice teachers at the beginning of the year. Principals in Chicago, in 1904, were asked for specific reports on handwriting and were required to fill out a questionnaire on their preferences for vertical or slant writing. Young principals in New York were commended, in 1905, for a "growing individuality" in their work

¹Fifty-first Annual Report, New York, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

²Fifth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1903, p. 109.

in various subjects, and all principals were encouraged to make their schools eminent in "some one thing," such as language, mathematics, on the supposition that, with this accomplished, they would not rest until their schools excelled in all things.¹ In 1905, a committee of Chicago principals prepared a report for the Superintendent on the appropriate uses of seat work in the primary grades, and made an outline of seat work suitable for the first three grades.² A similar committee the same year devised a test in English which was given in all seventh grades in the city. The results of the tests were discussed in a meeting of the principals and their seventh-grade teachers with the Superintendent.³ A New York principal and two of his teachers in 1908 constructed their own reading materials for the first grade, and had the materials mimeographed and illustrated.

Fear that principals were overdoing the introduction of new methods led an associate superintendent in the New York schools in 1909 to sound a word of warning:

"The principals and their assistants continue to show commendable zeal in their endeavors to improve the work in their schools; at times, however, a hint of warning is necessary to prevent the overzealous from assuming that everything new is necessarily an improvement. Wishing to be considered progressive, a principal is occasionally led not only to adopt every device that he thinks finds favor at headquarters, but also to give extravagant praise to his success, even when the change may have been disadvantageous. In penmanship, for instance, a principal converted to a belief in a new method will require the use of the latter by pupils of the upper grades whose style is already formed, with the result that the previous good writing of a class is changed in a few weeks to something quite the reverse."⁴

New methods and innovations in materials and subject matter, nevertheless, continued to be initiated by principals from time to time. Garden lessons, special materials for teaching oral English, classes in nature study, developing drill materials in arithmetic, improved standards for rating and reporting pupils' work, experiments in unifying kindergarten and first grade work,

¹Seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1905, pp. 168-71.

²Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1905, p. 219.

³Ibid., p. 233.

⁴Eleventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1909, p. 251.

provisions for concrete civic training, listing errors in pupils' speech, securing co-operation of parents in the improvement of oral English, and grouping of pupils within classes for the improvement of instruction were representative of the creative supervisory projects of principals from 1910 to 1916. Associate Superintendent Knox of St. Louis, in reporting on an experiment at the Laclede School in a new approach and treatment in the study of the United States constitution, highly commended the initiative of the principal. He stated that the beneficial results were not confined to the pupils alone, but also influenced favorably the interest and attitude of parents toward the work of the school. He quoted the following summary of Principal Reavis on the results of the procedure:

"This plan of teaching the United States constitution has many advantages over the memoriter method that quite generally prevails, (1) It requires no more time. (2) It renders interesting and full of purpose work that is ordinarily very difficult and uninteresting to children. (3) It gives the pupils a much more comprehensive and concrete knowledge of a topic in history which as it is often taught, is so abstract and foreign to the interests of children that the results are mere verbiage. (4) It gives the child a proper attitude toward the constitution as a document of judicious compromise by helping him realize the great difficulty of its making. (5) The dramatic treatment renders alive for children pages in our history that must meet responses in their lives, or else our effort in teaching history is wasted and the results fail in their purpose."¹

The conventional meetings with school or grade groups of teachers, held at weekly or monthly intervals, were utilized by the principal during this period, but there was also a trend toward making meetings more democratic; that is, by using them as agencies for securing more teacher participation in school policies. In 1903, Superintendent Cooley of Chicago initiated a plan whereby twelve key members of the Principals' Association were made heads of committees. Every principal in the city belonged to one of the central committees and all met with the superintendent at regular monthly meetings. Policies and procedures advanced by this organization were usually made the subject of staff meetings in local schools, so that teacher opinion and co-operation might be secured.² Several years later, Superintendent Young of

¹Sixty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1915, pp. 71-72.

²Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1903, p. 12.

the same city pointed out that the principal's position was "administrative, executive, and instructional," and the teacher's, executive, instructional, and social." Dr. Young's democratic policy eventuated into a series of councils whereby the teachers' ideas on instruction and other matters were given voice. However, her plan contained one unique feature, namely, that the teachers' opinion were conveyed direct to the superintendent, the principal not being permitted to attend the meetings of his staff.¹ At times principals in other cities² organized local councils to give the teachers a voice in school policies. The description of an organization designed especially to improve instruction is contained in the report of District Superintendent Lee of New York, in 1914:

"In Public School 10, Mr. Newman, Principal, the teaching corps has been organized into committees on English, Mathematics, History, Geography, Nature Study and Manual Training. Each committee is in charge of a chairman, who teaches the respective subject in the departmental classes. Every grade has a representative on each of these committees. Departmental meetings are held every month, and these are followed by grade meetings, in which the delegates present the topics of departmental discussion to their colleagues. In this way the work of the entire school is unified and correlated and co-operation from every teacher of the corps is obtained."³

While the evidence of new types of tests used by principals during this period is meager, a trend toward more scientific uses of tests is indicated. No record was found of the use of standardized achievement tests, but a principal was cited in 1913 as using Binet Tests.⁴ Principals also devised special tests in arithmetic,⁵ constructed tests to cover essential points in courses of study,⁶ and secured the co-operation of newspapers in testing the use of rules of grammar in writing paragraphs.⁷

¹Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1913, p. 25.

²Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1914, p. 487.

³Ibid.

⁴Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1913, p. 397.

⁵Ibid., p. 409.

⁶Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., pp. 497-98.

⁷Ibid., p. 495.

Departmentalization was employed in 132 schools in New York City in 1903, and principals were requested to inform the Superintendent how it affected the interest, conduct, and scholarship of the pupils.¹ In 1905, principals expressed themselves as being opposed to having departmental work made obligatory. At that time, 146 had departmental organization in their schools, and 92 did not have it.² Principals in New York were devoting considerable attention to providing special classes for, and adapting materials and instruction to, over-age and mentally defective children during the years 1908-1914. Double-time plans, and parallel courses were among the devices utilized for this purpose. St. Louis principals were cited in 1907 as studying the characteristics of mentally defective children, and a Chicago principal in 1910 reported on a plan to meet the needs of undernourished children.³

Discovery of equable standards for teacher rating proved to be a problem during the early years of the period under discussion. Where district superintendents as well as principals rated teachers, there was frequently a great difference in the ratings of the two officials.⁴ The fact that promotions and appointments were often based on the marks caused criticism of the principal's ratings. In some instances, the board of superintendents attempted to equalize ratings given by principals by comparing the work of the various schools.⁵ In 1913, a suitable basis for rating was still a problem, principals being criticized for inspecting the work of young teachers, pencil and notebook visible, before giving them supervisory assistance.⁶ Skill in teaching, discipline, and co-operation in the work of the school were the chief criteria for ratings by principals.⁷

¹Fifth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit.,
p. 75.

²Seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit.,
pp. 191-203.

³Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1910, pp. 115-16.

⁴Seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., pp. 157-58.

⁵Fifty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1905, p. 146.

⁶Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 249-50.

⁷Fifty-first Annual Report, Chicago, op. cit., pp. 147-48.

General aspects of the principal's supervision during the period are deserving of attention. Principals in large cities were well established as the chief supervisory heads of their schools. Assistant superintendents, as a rule, made recommendations regarding classwork in a school only after conferring with the principal.¹ The principal was usually supplied with clerical and administrative assistance sufficient to relieve him of clerical and petty routine, and at times, of a portion of his supervisory load.² He was allowed considerable latitude in carrying out the provisions of courses of study, and in adapting instruction to community needs.³ And yet a limitation of the evidence of reports of superintendents and school boards must here be considered, namely, that the records often do not show how widespread the supervisory activities were among the principals of a city school system. Superintendents are prone to dwell upon positive achievements in their reports. Nevertheless, criticisms of the attitude and accomplishments of principals are found which indicate that in many instances they were not, as a group, living up to their opportunities. In New York, for example, principals were criticized for not taking advantage of freedom to adopt the course of study to groups of varying ability,⁴ and for failure to give demonstration lessons and other assistance to young teachers.⁵ In Chicago Superintendent Young wrote as follows in 1912:

"As is always the case in a city in which the district superintendents and principals are not subject to 'thou shalt', there are districts and schools that have not yet heard of the effort to improve penmanship."⁶

New York principals in 1913 were not able wholly to refute McMurry's statement made in connection with the New York Survey, namely, that "the great mass of principals are not students of instruction."⁷

¹Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1903, pp. 235-36.

²Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1911, pp. 243-46.

³Fourteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1912, pp. 130-31.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 106.

⁶Fifty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1912, p. 103.

⁷Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 495-505.

An assistant superintendent in St. Louis, in his report of 1916, formulated nine questions which might be regarded as standards for an efficient school at that time. The points included were (1) physical and social conditions, (2) social environment of pupils, (3) supervision based on pedagogic principles, (4) effective execution of functions of the principal, (5) general and specific aims of the course of study realized, (6) liberal interpretation of functions by principal and teachers, (7) adequacy of supplementary services, (8) spirit of school as shown by interrelationships of principal, teachers, pupils and parents, and (9) influence of school on lives of both children and adults of the community. He found that the work of almost all of the schools of his district depended on a predominantly progressive or conservative point of view of the principal, and that systematic exercise of the principal's functions were very generally in evidence. An excerpt from his report states that

"The progressive schools, best typified by the, and schools, are seeking by a shift in the centers of interest and in modes of procedure to more specifically adapt their work to local conditions, or to changing conceptions of educational methods and values. The conservative schools, best typified by the,, and, are seeking by refinement of method and systematic coordination to make more effective tried and accepted educational practices. Both are rendering valuable services in contributing or improving the elements which in their combination ultimately constitute the strength of the schools."¹

Supervisory Activities of Principals Established since 1920

Two factors which greatly influenced supervision by the principal in the years around 1920 were the prestige given to intelligence tests and achievement tests in the World War, and the formation, previously mentioned, of the Department of Elementary School Principals. The former resulted in putting into the principals' hands tools for making scientific studies of his supervisory problems; the latter provided a stimulus for making the studies and a medium for publishing results. Principals, as a consequence, were able to base procedures on factual data to an extent not previously possible, and their supervision for the first time assumed the characteristics of a science.

¹Sixty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1916, pp. 272-73.

Classroom visitation.- Considerable attention was given in the early years immediately following 1920 to the necessity of the principal's spending a large share of his time in the classrooms. McAndrew in 1924 stated the problem as follows:

"The attempt of other school systems to get their principals out of the office chairs and into the work area indicates a general educational trend. Those of our principals and supervisors who have been most in their classrooms, not away on committee meetings or looking for new teachers, have been commended during the year. Supervision is a steady requirement."¹

In many school systems the practice was followed of having the principals make a record of the results of each visit to a classroom, furnishing a copy of the record to the teacher, and filing a second copy in the administrative office. Some of the advantages claimed for the plan were that it insured frequent visitation of classes, stimulated higher efforts on the part of teachers, and enabled district superintendents to tell from inspection of the records where attention was most needed.² Principals were encouraged to study personally during such visits the work of pupils in special, as well as general, subjects.³ Many maintained scheduled hours for visits of other principals and teachers to their schools, and records of such visits were kept in the principal's office.⁴ Visits by groups of principals to demonstrations of teaching arranged by home principals were common.⁵

Teachers' meetings and conferences.- Staff meetings in Chicago, according to a sampling from ten representative schools, were held by principals on an average of twelve times during the school year ending in June, 1925. They were "planned intelligently, minutes kept and teaching benefitted." Previous to this time principals had held meetings at irregular intervals, often hastily arranged, and with an "apologetic" attitude.⁶ In response

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1924, p. 18.

²Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1925, p. 250.

³Ibid., p. 71.

⁴Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1927, p. 378.

⁵Thirtieth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1928, p. 382.

⁶Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1925, p. 40.

to a request from principals for suggestions in planning effective conferences, Superintendent McAndrew submitted a number of hints gleaned from business manuals covering staff conferences:

(1) listing needs, (2) classifying needs and making a program, (3) scheduling times of meetings, (4) putting schedule in form of bulletin to teachers, (5) starting meeting promptly and closing on time, (6) covering points concisely and recapitulating at the end, and (7) not permitting a few to monopolize discussion. He recommended as helpful in staff meetings a list of books compiled by superintendents, professors of education, librarians, and research workers, and published for use of principals.¹ Principals' conferences with teachers in New York in 1930 centered about such topics as new courses of study, composition and letter writing, drill, problems of beginning teachers, professional courses for teachers, and visits to other schools. Methods of conducting conferences varied from an expository lecture to an open forum discussion. Freedom of teachers to present points of view and individual problems was especially emphasized. Principals, assistant-principals, and grade leaders presided.² It is worthy of note that the New York procedure appears more in keeping with modern democratic practices than that of Chicago.

Tests and measurements.- Experimental use of intelligence and achievement tests by principals in 1921 was sporadic, due to the fact that they were often obliged, in the absence of a special fund, to furnish them at their own expense.³ Even at that date, however, principals had reached two conclusions, (1) that pupils' scores in silent reading were frequently found to be above the grade standards of the tests, and (2) that teachers derived considerable professional training from administering and scoring the tests.⁴ Two years later the principal's responsibilities, with respect to field tests administered through a division of tests and measurements, were defined as criticizing the plan of testing before it was put into operation in his school, and selecting the time for giving the tests, except in the case of survey tests required by the superintendent. The services which the principal might derive from the testing division were enumerated as (1) utilizing the testing service for checking his

¹Ibid., pp. 40-41.

²Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 366.

³Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1921, pp. 74-75.

⁴Ibid.

administrative or supervisory policies, or for comparing results secured in his school with those of other schools.¹

Tests were used by principals for self-surveys of their schools in such subjects as handwriting, spelling, reading, and problem analysis. The results were interpreted, and suggestions for improvement discussed at staff meetings.²

Other uses of standard achievement tests by principals were to supplement results obtained from informal tests, and in conjunction with intelligence, to discover whether pupils were achieving results comparable with their general abilities. Standardized tests finding particular favor with principals for these purposes were Otis Reasoning Test, Monroe Diagnostic Test, Thorndike McCall Reading Test, New York Standard Geography Test, and Woody-McCall Test in the fundamentals of Arithmetic.³ Committees of principals constructed series of informal tests for subjects in all grades.⁴ Tests were used to discover weaknesses of seventh grade pupils in arithmetic and English; the personnel tests of a life insurance company were given to upper grade pupils to answer criticism on the abilities of pupils in arithmetic fundamentals; and tests in science were given to evaluate teaching procedures in that subject.⁵ Batteries of reading tests were used to measure the individual progress of pupils from month to month;⁶ tests were given to determine the value of remedial work;⁷ and additional knowledge of the special subjects was sought by principals through the medium of special tests.⁸

Principals in St. Louis requisitioned 295,000 copies of test forms for use in 1930, an average of three tests for each pupil enrolled. Principals in that city were cited as being the

¹Sixty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1923, pp. 3-15.

²Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1926, p. 225.

³Ibid., pp. 245-46.

⁴Thirtieth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 413.

⁵Thirty-first Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1929, p. 331.

⁶Seventy-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1929, p. 44.

⁷Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 397.

⁸Ibid.

best qualified persons in the system for interpreting test results, owing to their knowledge of the pupils' abilities and social conditions prevalent in the community,¹ and they were expected to assist the teacher in the proper interpretation and application of test results.² Principals in two supervisory districts in New York were reported as having secured the intelligence quotients of all first grade pupils by means of individual tests, and of all pupils above the first grade, by means of group intelligence tests. The results were utilized in grouping pupils within grades and within classes, in order better to adapt instruction to individual needs.³ Principals co-operated with district superintendents in utilizing intelligence tests and standardized tests as aids in rating the efficiency of schools.⁴

Improvement of methods.- The supervision of the principal, in 1925, was expected to be scientific. He was expected to know the conditions of his school in a specific sense -- what methods were to be employed, according to scientific principles in the various grades in each subject.⁵ Principals utilized scientific studies to discover in what grades oral reading was most effective⁶ and the lists of Horn, Ashbaugh and others were their guides in the supervision of spelling.⁷ Graphs and other statistical devices were employed in illustrating pupil progress in arithmetic computation.⁸

In St. Louis, principals, as the chief supervisors of their schools, were expected to call on the supervisors for expert help to teachers having difficulties in getting good results in the various subjects.⁹ Principals in New York conducted experiments in methods in conjunction with staff members of professional

¹Seventy-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 46.

²Seventy-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1930, p. 30.

³Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 341.

⁴Ibid., pp. 388-89.

⁵Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 70.

⁶Ibid., pp. 30-31.

⁷Annual Report of the Superintendent, Chicago, 1925, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

⁸Ibid., pp. 30-31.

⁹Seventy-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1926, pp. 15-16.

schools,¹ and principals were reported as gaining such an intelligent grasp of the theory of kindergarten work that additional supervisors for that department ceased to be employed.² Controlled experiments were conducted in testing remedial procedures in arithmetic, in determining the relative values of Austrian and other methods of subtraction, and in evaluating the effectiveness of flash cards for developing speed and comprehension in primary reading.³ Projects of an experimental nature were the teaching of multiplication without memorizing tables,⁴ the use of study periods,⁵ teaching of reading through picture study,⁶ teaching geography through study of local conditions,⁷ classes of pupils with I.Q.'s below 50, the lower limit for subnormal divisions,⁸ and group-study technic for pupils of the upper grades.⁹ Among the special aids for new teachers devised by principals were plans for organization and unification of classroom routine,¹⁰ and printed lesson plans for study periods.¹¹

Pupil adjustment.- Principals exercised the authority to select pupils to be examined for special rooms and special schools.¹² In addition, they were permitted general powers, such as grouping pupils and adapting courses of study to fit the groups, and to adjust the size of bright and slow classes.¹³ However, the

¹Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
New York, op. cit., p. 216.

²Ibid., p. 266.

³Ibid., pp. 22-23.

⁴Thirty-first Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
New York, op. cit., p. 361.

⁵Thirtieth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
New York, op. cit., p. 412.

⁶Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
New York, op. cit., p. 344.

⁷Ibid., p. 358.

⁸Ibid., pp. 350-51.

⁹Ibid., p. 349.

¹⁰Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
New York, op. cit., p. 30.

¹¹Thirty-first Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
New York, op. cit., p. 360.

¹²Sixty-eighth Annual Report of the School Board of
St. Louis, 1922, p. 42.

¹³Thirtieth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
New York, op. cit., p. 34.

placing of children in special classes was ignored according to one superintendent, owing to delays in visits of the examiners of the child-study division.¹ Principals also utilized the services of visiting teachers as a supervisory aid in adjusting the work of problem pupils.² Superintendents urged more scientific standards for the promotion of pupils, with the view of eliminating excessive retardation.³ Principals conducted studies of the relation of health to other capacities, such as mental ability and special aptitudes,⁴ and devised special curriculum units in health.⁵

Teacher rating.- Most large school systems were still experimenting with marking systems for teachers during the early years of the period. The main problems were the bases for the ratings, and the words or symbols by which these should be expressed.⁶ Ratings given by principals were reported as not correlating highly with the work of their schools viewed as a whole.⁷ In response to inquiries of superintendents, principals expressed the opinion that not more than twenty-five per cent of a given corps should receive the highest mark for any one item on the rating form.⁸

General aspects.- An outstanding development since 1918 has been the emphasis placed upon the principal's ability to stimulate the professional growth of members of his staff.⁹ Prior to this period emphasis had been placed upon teacher training; the modern point of view is that the best method of training a teacher is to stimulate in her an attitude of self-improvement. Among the means cited for promoting professional improvement of teachers have been compilation of individual records of each

¹Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 45.

²Ibid.

³Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., pp. 71-72.

⁴Thirty-third Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1931, p. 85.

⁵Ibid., p. 395.

⁶Annual Report of the Superintendent, Chicago, 1925, op. cit., pp. 78-81.

⁷Thirtieth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., pp. 402-03.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 49.

teacher as a basis for future professional endeavor,¹ provision for using professional literature,² conducting of professional study classes by principals in connection with local educational institutions,³ encouraging membership in teachers professional organizations,⁴ and discussion of professional problems in conferences.⁵ Such activities are an outgrowth of the principal's own professional growth. He has tended to attain the status of a professional leader, keeping foremost the policy effectively enunciated by the superintendent of a large city school system, namely, that every response to a supervisory problem "should be determined scientifically by a study of all pertinent facts."⁶

¹Thirtieth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 382.

²Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 397.

³Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 349.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Seventy-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1927, p. 14.

CHAPTER V

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PRINCIPAL TO GENERAL AND SPECIAL SUPERVISORS

As city school systems developed in size and in complexity of organization, superintendents were obliged to employ two types of supervisory assistants. The growth of cities, as related in a previous chapter, forced early superintendents to turn over local supervision to the principals, and to devote their own efforts, in turn, to supervising the principals. However, cities grew in size far beyond the expectations of school boards and superintendents, and it was not long before a multiplicity of duties made it impossible for the superintendents adequately to supervise the activities of the principals. The logical step, therefore, was to employ assistant superintendents to inspect schools, give advice and assistance to principals, and see that the policies of the superintendent were carried out in the schools. Such assistants, variously designated as assistant superintendents, deputy superintendents, and district superintendents, came to be known as general supervisors. On the other hand, changing social conditions brought a number of new subjects into the schools, practically all of which were unknown to the regular teachers. Consequently, specialists were employed to see that the new subjects were properly taught. They worked directly with the teachers, giving assistance and guidance in such subjects as music, drawing, physical education, manual training, and kindergarten activities. Assistants of this type acquired the designation of special supervisors.

Since the local school was the chief field of activity for both general and special supervisors, working relationships between them and the principals became necessary. It is the purpose of this chapter to trace the development of the relationships and their influence on the functions of the principal. The office of general supervisor evolved earlier than that of the special supervisor; consequently its bearings on the development of the principalship are here given priority of treatment.

General Supervisors and Principals Prior to 1900

The first assistant superintendents.- New York had associate superintendents as early as 1854.¹ They were required to visit schools "frequently and periodically," to examine and inspect, to ascertain progress, and to advise teachers and local officers regarding discipline, books, courses, and condition of school houses.² The first assistant superintendent of the St. Louis schools was appointed in 1868.³ The first officer of this type in Chicago was appointed in 1870. He was given the supervision of the independent primary schools and the assignment of substitute teachers.⁴ In 1876, a board of supervisors whose members corresponded to assistant superintendents, was appointed in Boston. The visiting and examining of schools were listed among the duties of the individual members.⁵ In 1873, Superintendent Harris, in commenting on the organization of supervision throughout the country, stated that in large cities, the supervision of the superintendent was supplemented by assistant superintendents and supervising principals.⁶

Early contacts of assistant superintendents and principals.- Assistant superintendents participated in the controversy initiated by New York principals in 1859 concerning examinations given by the central office. The outcome of the controversy, it may be recalled from the discussion of a previous chapter, was that the Board of Superintendents agreed not to use the results of the examinations as bases for comparing schools. In concluding his report regarding the settlement of the matter, the superintendent stated that the assistant superintendents and he would not hesitate to yield their convictions in certain respects,

"deeming it of the utmost importance that harmony and union should, if possible, invariably characterize the relations subsisting between themselves and those engaged in the

¹Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1854, p. 5.

²Ibid., p. 5.

³Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1868, p. 73.

⁴Sixteenth Annual Report of the School Board of Chicago, 1870, p. 112.

⁵Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1876, pp. 7-8.

⁶Nineteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1873, p. 190.

immediate charge of the schools confided to their supervision."¹

Even before the advent of assistant superintendents in St. Louis, a regulation of the school board prevented interference with the principal's management of his school by any school official. The regulation read as follows:

"Each principal shall be permitted, without interference on the part of any member of the Board, or the Superintendent, to arrange the details for the internal government of their schools according to their own method, provided such method is not inconsistent with the general regulations of the schools; such Principals, of course, being liable to be judged of, as to their qualifications, by the results they may produce."²

A point which should not be overlooked, was the fact that in many cities, local trustees and ward officers continued for a long time to act in the capacity of general supervisors. In New York, the superintendent in 1859 devoted considerable space in his annual report to supervision by trustees and ward officers, indicating a number of factors in supervision commonly neglected by these officials. Ten years later, the following rule of the Board of Education of Cincinnati was published in the Annual Report:

"Complaints on the part of Local Trustees against the Principal or any teacher of their school, either for persistent disregard of the Rules of the Board, the Regulations of the schools, or of their own requisitions made under the authority of the Board, and complaints on the part of teachers against their Local Trustees for unauthorized and pernicious interference in the management of their schools, shall, in the first instance, be referred to the Committee on Discipline."³

In 1867, Assistant Superintendent Jones of New York examined pupils recommended for promotion to grammar schools by primary principals. As a basis for this action, he stated that reports had been frequent that principals of grammar schools were bringing pressure upon primary principals for large numbers of

¹Eighteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1859, p. 10.

²Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1866, pp. xxxiv-v (append.).

³Thirty-ninth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1869, p. 190.

graduating pupils to swell the enrolments of the grammar schools. He pointed out that the best interests of the pupils, rather than the special benefit of principals, should be the main consideration in promotions of pupils.¹ The cause of the assistant superintendent's apprehension was undoubtedly due to the policy, followed in New York at the time, of basing the salary schedule of principals on the average attendance of the schools.

The placing of the primary schools of Boston under supervisors in 1879 threw an interesting light on the functions of supervisors as compared with those of principals. It was found that the supervisors were expected to function as principals,² and attention was focussed as seldom before on the differences between the functions of principals and general supervisors. The advisability of the principal's having charge of all phases of the work of his schools was brought home vividly to the grammar school principals, and the lukewarm attitude they had previously displayed toward the work of the primary grades disappeared after the primary schools were restored, in 1882, to their supervision.³ Evidences of friction between assistant superintendents and principals were revealed in the pronouncements made from time to time for the apparent purpose of fixing supervisory responsibility in local schools. Careful analysis of such pronouncements suggests that much of the maladjustment of relations between assistant superintendents and principals was due to the latter's jealousy of any action that appeared to diminish their prestige with teachers and pupils. Howland, in 1884, wrote as follows:

"Any authority coming in to supercede him in the direct management of the school, in the examination of pupils or the arrangement of classes, must depreciate his influence and tend to the injury of the school. Schools may suffer from too much as well as from too little supervision."⁴

In 1888, fifteen years after Dr. Harris made the statement previously alluded to regarding supervising principals, St. Louis abandoned the policy of having principals supervise schools other than their own, and increased the number of assistant superin-

¹Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1867, pp. 54-60.

²Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1882,
p. 21.

³Ibid., 1903, pp. 69-70.

⁴Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1884, pp. 57-58.

tendents. The assistants, moreover, were given definite portions or districts of the city to supervise. It was claimed by the president of the board that, in addition to saving money, the plan was also expected to improve the efficiency of the schools.¹

New York, in 1894, likewise divided the city into districts to be supervised by the assistant superintendents, but it was admitted that while the plan presented some advantages, it was not at the time certain that it was superior to the former plan.² The reaction of principals to this change is not known, though it undoubtedly had the effect of making the principal more definitely responsible to a given assistant superintendent, and of lending greater unity to their common interests.

Assistant superintendents frequently depended on meetings of principals for introducing new educational ideas and announcing the policies of the central office.³ New courses of study were often explained during these meetings.⁴ The assistant superintendents usually utilized their visits to schools for examining classes, and for giving guidance and assistance to teachers and principals.⁵ A supervisor in 1896 stated that his time was consumed by class-room visitation, conferences with principals, and meetings with the board of supervisors, sixty-four of the latter having been held during the year.⁶ The supervisory load of a general supervisor at times was as high as 12,000 pupils, 300 teachers, and 19 principals.⁷

Supervisor Martin of Boston, in discussing the amount of the supervisor's work in 1896, pointed out that it would be impossible for one person to be familiar with the work of three hundred teachers, even if every school day were available for supervisory visits. Yet he felt that some one should have close contact with the teachers and utilize it to shape their work to the most effective ends. This, in his opinion, was "the supreme

¹Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1888, p. 16.

²Fifty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1894, p. 120.

³Forty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1897, p. 21.

⁴Fiftieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1891, p. 21.

⁵Forty-third Annual Report, St. Louis, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁶Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1896, p. 118.

⁷Ibid., pp. 85-97.

function of the principals." Furthermore, he believed (1) that principals should be freed of all prescribed classroom teaching, (2) that they should minimize clerical and administrative duties by distributing them among the teachers, (3) that they should avoid the danger of taking too large a responsibility for the conduct of individual pupils, and (4) that if all principals spent as much time in the classroom as some principals were accustomed to spend, they would discover and solve many serious problems met by pupils and teachers.¹

Rating of principals by general supervisors.- Assistant superintendents rated principals in New York on the "general management" of their schools as early as 1870. The rating, according to the Superintendent, was based on such factors as "order during general exercises," classification and organization of the school, "general direction given to the teachers," conformity with a uniform plan of operation," constancy of supervision,² and influence exerted throughout the entire school. In 1871, the following table appeared in the Superintendent's report:³

GENERAL MANAGEMENT OF THE SCHOOLS

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Indifferent	Bad	Total
Male Grammar Schools	33	18	3	--	-	54
Female Grammar Schools	39	8	1	--	-	48
Primary Department and Schools	50	59	2	--	-	111
Colored Schools	1	8	1	--	-	10
Total	123	93	7	--	-	223
Total in 1870	74	93	16	--	-	183

Attention was invited to the showing of the record of principals in 1871 over that of the previous year. Assistant Superintendent Harrison defined "the true standard of excellence in the management of a school" to be an organization so perfected that each

¹Ibid., p. 119.

²Twenty-Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1870, pp. 146-47.

³Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1871, p. 206.

part would work "in harmony with every other part," and all produce the desired effect. If such an organization were secured, the principal alone would be entitled to the credit for it, and if it were wanting, the principal would be answerable for the deficiency.¹

At first the evaluations of general management were based on careful observation,² but in 1873, reference was made to the use of examinations consisting of careful inquiries for this purpose. It was admitted, however, that it was difficult in judging the principal's efficiency to make due allowance for the injurious effects of weak teachers appointed, promoted, or transferred without his advice or consent.³ In 1875, Superintendent Kiddle summarized the points on which the efficiency of principals should be rated, as follows: (1) sanitary condition of school, (2) general administrative control, (3) classification and promotions, (4) adaptation of text books to the work of the grades, (5) attention to manual of instruction, (6) classroom visitation, (7) direction of teachers' work and (8) condition of school records. He admitted that it was often difficult to obtain definite facts regarding some of the factors, and that sometimes it was necessary for the assistant superintendent to interrogate classroom teachers regarding the conduct of the principal, though this method was justified only when the deficiency or neglect was very obvious.⁴

The Superintendent in New York continued to publish annually the number of principals receiving each of the ratings: "excellent," "good," "fair," "indifferent," and "bad," up to 1887. During the period 1870-1887, only two ratings of "indifferent" and four ratings of "bad" were recorded. There was a gradual increase in the proportion of ratings of "excellent" during the period. In 1870, 40.4 per cent of the principals rated were marked "excellent"; 50.8 per cent were rated "good"; and 8.7 per cent were rated "fair." In 1883, the Superintendent invited attention to the fact that 89 per cent of the principals received the mark of "excellent," as compared with 84 per cent of the previous year. In 1887, 96.3 per cent of the principals were marked "excellent"; six were rated "good"; one "fair"; and one "bad."⁵ When a school was rated

¹Ibid., pp. 206-207.

²Twenty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 146.

³Thirty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1873, pp. 253-55.

⁴Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1875, pp. 219-21.

⁵Forty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1887, p. 124.

deficient, the assistant superintendents were required to visit it again within six months. If still deficient, a report was made by the superintendent either recommending that the principal be removed, or giving reasons why such recommendation was withheld. In case removal was not recommended, the assistant superintendents were expected to visit the school frequently and do everything in their power to instruct the principal and improve the management of the school.¹

Views of general supervisors regarding their relations with principals.- Few better sources of information could be found regarding the relationship existing between general supervisors and principals than the reports of supervisors concerning their own problems. An illuminating excerpt from the report of Supervisor Peterson of Boston reads as follows:

"The absence of real power and authority in the Board of Supervisors in determining educational policies and principles is nowhere better illustrated than in the relations of supervisors to principals. The pleasant and harmonious relations that now exist between these two bodies of public-school servants are the product rather of negative action, of good sense, and of a desire to co-operate than of positive, strong, and abiding principles - principles that have been arrived at after thorough investigation and discussion. Evils that might have been prevented by authoritative action of the Board of Supervisors - if it had had the authority - have been treated with the highly respectable but ineffective remedies, viz., suggestion, recommendation, and advice. These remedies have been applied even when evils have not existed; indeed, there is a great deal of threshing of old straw - so pleasant is it to believe that one is doing his duty, if he but give good advice."²

Supervisor Peterson indicated that the remedy for the situation so caustically presented in the foregoing passage was the fixing of the responsibilities of both supervisor and principal. Continuing, he stated that

"A clear and distinct line of separation should be drawn between the duties of supervisor and the duties of principal. Were this done, conflict, repetition, and overlapping of duties would, in the interests of unity, vigor, and economy, be avoided."³

¹Fiftieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 123-24.

²Annual Report, 1896, op. cit., pp. 86-87.

³Ibid., p. 87.

Peterson cited, as an illustration of the policy, the procedure adopted the previous year regarding evidence for fitness of pupils to receive diplomas. The evidence was formerly secured in part by examinations given by the Board of Supervisors, but under the new plan, the evidence was all furnished by the principals, and the Board decided from the evidence submitted whether or not the candidates should receive their diplomas. Thus, in Peterson's opinion, the responsibilities of each group were fixed.¹

The foregoing statements suggest a strong individualism - at times an imperviousness to official advice - on the part of principals. Supervisor Martin, a member of the same system, and writing at the same time, openly commented on the strong individualism of the principals. However, he pointed out the advantages of such individualism instead of recommending prescribed limitations for it. He stated that the degree of individualism was "strikingly shown" by the variation of individual schools in his district with respect to (1) grades in which manual training was taught, (2) whether or not the principal introduced enrichment courses into the school, (3) the prevalence or absence of departmental instruction, (4) utilization of parallel courses, (5) adherence to the course of study in English, and (6) the system of handwriting employed. Martin arrived at two conclusions as the result of the facts which he assembled. The first was that conference and discussion in the light of educational principles would bring about a more desirable uniformity of practice; the second that the independent character of Boston principals gave them a greater opportunity to adapt the work to the needs of their districts, and a greater opportunity for educational leadership, than prevailed in cities with more rigid organization.²

That the principals of Boston were not the only ones striving to maintain their independence (and doing a pretty fair job of it) is revealed in the reports of assistant superintendents of Chicago during approximately the same years. One assistant superintendent of that city reported that work in his division was proceeding in accordance with the course of study, as interpreted by the district superintendents working in "close and cordial relations" with the principals.³ Another report testified that means were being employed to unify the work of the division, but that care was being observed not to detract from the individuality of

¹Ibid., p. 87.

²Ibid., pp. 120-23.

³Forty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1900, p. 227.

the principal.¹ Still another assistant superintendent stated that in meetings held for the purpose of discussing pedagogical questions, the principals were given the utmost liberty consistent with a unity of the system, and that while wide divergences of opinion were shown, the discussions were stimulating.²

The fact that general supervisors, as well as principals, were required to rate all teachers was a frequent source of friction, even though superintendents found that the ratings of the two groups of officials, independently made, often showed a surprising degree of agreement.³ When the regulation requiring general supervisors in Boston to rate all teachers annually was rescinded, Supervisor Martin stated that it was a great advantage to be relieved from the obligation to rate teachers in "studied ignorance of the judgment of principals" and that the elimination of the requirement would (1) give the supervisors more freedom in their work, and (2) make it possible to "sustain more confidential relations" with the principals and so "to secure more cordial co-operation between these two coordinate branches" of the service.⁴

An illuminating example of how cordial relations between general supervisor and principal made supervision more co-operative and intelligent was revealed by the report of a supervisor in 1898. An excerpt, here quoted, also suggested how much light the reports of principals, had they been published, would have thrown on the supervisory methods of the time:

"The supervisor learns much from the principals - perhaps more than he imparts. He hears of the local peculiarities of the district, the character of the homes of the pupils, the traditions of the school, the personal characteristics of the assistant teachers, their weaknesses and their strength both partially concealed from the occasional visitor, their efforts at self-improvement, the out of school burdens they are carrying in shape of family labors and anxieties, the new plans they are devising, the new methods they are trying, their loyalty or want of it. He learns what views of discipline and instruction guide the principals in their administration, what pedagogical studies they are pursuing, and what are their ideals of public work."⁵

¹Ibid., p. 228.

²Ibid., p. 229.

³Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1897, p. 79.

⁴Annual Report, 1896, op. cit., p. 118.

⁵Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1898, p. 119.

General recognition of the principal as the chief local supervisor.- By 1900, the principal was accepted as the director of supervision as well as of general administration in his school. A Boston supervisor in 1895 pointed out that all classes in a school were "under the immediate control and supervision of the principal" and that each teacher was responsible to him for her work and must look to him for assistance in times of need.¹ In 1898, Superintendent Soldan of St. Louis after characterizing the principal as the "highest local authority," emphasized the following points: (1) that supervisors because of the small amount of time they could spend in a school, could not directly share the principal's responsibility; (2) that when a superior officer criticized, or made suggestions regarding a teacher's work, he always did it by speaking to the principal; and (3) that every official communication to teachers was sent through the principal.²

The Period from 1900 to 1918

Superintendents' policies.- In 1903 Superintendent Cooley of Chicago stated that the individual school should be the unit of supervision, rather than the supervisory district, since the principal, teachers, and pupils of each school were engaged in the whole problem of education. Unity and co-operation, in his opinion, would thus come from within, instead of being imposed from without.³ In the same year, three primary supervisors were appointed in St. Louis to aid the district superintendents in visiting the classrooms of the first three grades. In 1904, Associate Superintendent Higgins of New York warned district superintendents not to carry their supervision into details that belonged to principals, lest certain principals should give "non-interference with the district superintendent" as an excuse for evading their full duty.⁴ Superintendent Cooley regarded the supervision by district superintendents close enough to prevent extremes but "not so minute" that a principal could feel that his own individuality was interfered with. A constant effort was being made to have teachers feel that

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1895,
p. 119.

²Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1898, pp. 79-81.

³Forty-ninth Annual Report of the School Board of Chicago, 1903, p. 54.

⁴Sixth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1904, p. 121.

their first allegiance was to the principal.¹ Superintendent Young of the same city in 1911 warned district superintendents against attention to minor details, reminding them that "constant inspection of the insignificant noted in short calls" was "over-supervision" of a type to be deplored.² District superintendents of New York were instructed in 1913 to be on guard against an attitude on the part of principals to consider the district superintendent as a dispenser of correct methods of instruction. This responsibility, they were informed, rested primarily with the principal, except in cases where methods of the principal were found to be inefficient, or varying greatly from accepted standards.³ Dr. Young complained, in 1913, of the lifeless conception of school work with which certain principals were satisfied, and stated that although the district superintendent should utilize diplomacy in bringing about improvement, in some cases a display of authority might be the final means.⁴

Interrelated functions of principals and general supervisors.- General supervisors have always been required to perform a number of duties in which principals were involved, sometimes jointly with the principal, and again as his superior line officer. Definite duties for district superintendents were rarely specified in board regulations; dependence was usually placed on the district superintendent's judgment, and on pronouncements or bulletins of superintendents.⁵ However, enough mention of specific activities are found in school documents to furnish a clew to their nature, and in one city (New York) a list of duties of district superintendents appeared for a few years in the annual reports of the superintendent.⁶

In 1904, principals were advised to confer with district

¹Fifty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1905, p. 145.

²Fifty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1911, p. 85.

³Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1913, p. 250.

⁴Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1913, p. 104.

⁵Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1918, p. 33.

⁶Tenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1908, p. 13.

superintendents before making assignments of teachers.¹ District superintendents in 1905 were required to rate the efficiency of principals on the bases of their administrative ability and their proficiency in supervising the work of teachers. The ratings were designated by "A," "B," "C," etc.² In 1908 district superintendents were required to report to superintendents on the needs of schools, to rate principals and teachers, to investigate all complaints regarding schools of their districts, to report principals for gross misconduct and suspend for the same, to assign teachers of special branches to the schools, and to approve, disapprove, or modify all requisitions of principals.³ Primary supervisors in 1912 submitted their plans to principals for approval.⁴ Associate and district superintendents were advised in the same year that one of their chief duties was to teach principals how to supervise and help teachers.⁵ The topics discussed at monthly meetings of district superintendents with their principals in 1913 were methods of teaching, school management, teachers absences, discipline, organization of schools, weak teachers, school districts, classroom work, model lessons, plan books, written work, tests, teachers ratings, and the like.⁶

A district superintendent invited attention in 1916 to the value of having principals report annually on the features of classwork and school management which they emphasized and the results they secured. These reports were helpful to the supervisor in showing to what extent the principal's judgment regarding the work of the school coincided with his own, in giving him an insight into the principal's attitude toward serious problems confronting the school, and furnishing him with evidence of the principal's ability to determine policies for improving the school.⁷

¹Sixth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., pp. 155-57.

²Seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of the City of New York, 1905, p. 159.

³Tenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 13.

⁴Fifty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1912, p. 45.

⁵Fourteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1912, pp. 131-32.

⁶Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1913, p. 348.

⁷Sixty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1916, pp. 275-76.

Development Since 1918

Activities of district superintendents.- District superintendents were occupied in 1925 in supervising methods of teaching in their districts, giving particular attention to oral and written composition, silent reading, handwriting, and the use of tests for determining the efficiency of teaching. They dealt with principals also in matters of classification of pupils, special classes for overage pupils, interclass and inter-school visits of principals and teachers, the supervision of inexperienced teachers and the like.¹ In 1926, conferences between the associate superintendent in charge of the building program and principals were held in New York for the purpose of standardizing the arrangement and equipment of regular and special classrooms.

Efficiency ratings of principals.- The plan in use in Chicago in 1926 for rating schools was reminiscent, in some respects, of that used in New York in the seventies for rating school management. However, several new factors appeared in the Chicago plan, which was designated as the "Standard School" by Superintendent McAndrew. The most important of these were ratings in pupil citizenship and in safety education.³

The scale used in Chicago at the time for rating the efficiency of the principals was prepared by the assistant and district superintendents. Superintendent McAndrew criticized it as being too subjective and not enough based on the actual achievements of pupils as the results of teaching and the principal's management. The factors of efficiency and the weights given to each were as follows: administration, 1-20 points; supervision, 1-60 points; and leadership, 1-20 points. Demerits for deficiencies might be specified. The final rating was computed as follows: 96-100, Superior; 90-95, Excellent; 80-89, Satisfactory; 75-79, Unsatisfactory; 0-74, Inefficient. Principals, in recommending further factors to be used for appraisal of their work, stressed utilization of statistical procedures in evaluating instruction, professional reading on the part of principals, membership in professional organizations, citizenship training, and participation

¹Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1925, p. 26.

²Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1926, p. 508.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Schools of Chicago, 1926, pp. 36-38.

⁴Ibid., pp. 38-40.

in educational experiments.

Special attention was invited by Superintendent McAndrew to the necessity for eliminating incompetent principals. He stated that in many large city school systems, teachers had been "marked down" while neglectful principals had been left undisturbed. In his opinion, a single inefficient principal caused greater harm than a dozen unsatisfactory teachers. Every "school manager" should realize what the community was entitled to in the way of efficient school work.¹

In New York, conferences of principals were called in 1930 to adopt more objective bases for the rating of schools by district superintendents.² Procedures approved by the principals as a result of these conferences were utilized in subsequent ratings.

Recent development in relations of principals and general supervisors.- In 1918, the offices of the district superintendents in Chicago were moved from the central administration building to schools in the various districts, in order to bring principals, teachers, and parents into "more immediate and convenient relation" with the staff of supervisors. This step was regarded by Superintendent Shoop as interposing a local administrative agent between the principal and the superintendent, and he feared that principals would react "hesitatingly" to such an innovation. He pointed out that responsibility must first center with the individual school, the principal acting as "the organizer and directing genius," and the district superintendent acting in an advisory capacity; nevertheless, the relation of principal to district superintendent was "still somewhat nebulous and undefined."³ Superintendent McAndrew, writing in 1924, stated that the "nebulosity" regarding the status of the district superintendent still existed. He suggested, in place of the vague relationship then existing, a strict line relationship between district superintendent and principal.⁴

Detroit, prior to 1923, introduced a plan of general supervision utilizing district principals. These officials were the equivalent of district superintendents, with the exception that they had buildings of their own. The supervisors' functions were classified as research, training, and field work. The district principals received such training as they needed from the super-

¹Ibid., p. 40.

²Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1930, pp. 388-89.

³Sixty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 33.

⁴Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1924, pp. 18-19.

visors, and, after experimentation in their own buildings, disseminated the basic information among the building principals of their respective districts.¹

Supervision in St. Louis was reorganized during the years 1925 to 1927 by decreasing the number of assistant superintendents and increasing the number of subject supervisors. All supervisors were placed under the direction of an assistant superintendent for the purpose of unifying their work.² The subject supervisors had no administrative authority; they suggested or recommended, and the principals made the final decisions.³ Visits of supervisors were expected to be governed by the needs of the schools, rather than by regular schedules, and principals were urged to request the assistance of the supervisors when needed.⁴ Though the role of district superintendents in the reorganization was not wholly clear, the reorganization appeared to replace general supervision, in a large measure, by special supervision. The effect of this policy appeared to give the principal more supervision without diminishing his prestige as the chief local supervisor of instruction.

Summary

The data presented regarding the relationship between principal and general supervisor show development mainly with respect to mutual co-operation based on professional considerations, rather than with respect to functions established as peculiar to each. Theoretically, the general supervisor has been, from the beginning, the superior line officer of the principal; actually he has rarely exercised his prerogatives except in routine matters. Superintendents have seldom clothed the general supervisors with defined supervisory powers, and the supervisors, except in sporadic cases, have not sought them. The data show that the principal succeeded in establishing himself as the supervisory head of his school prior to 1900, and that for two decades thereafter the district superintendent was relatively ineffective in influencing the work of principals. Some of this ineffectiveness was perhaps due to the professional inertia of the principals; more, undoubtedly to the lack of a scientific basis on which the district superintendent could initiate his supervisory policies. The beginning

¹Seventh Yearbook, Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals, Vol. VII, No. 3, pp. 242-44. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1928.

²Seventy-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1926, p. 15.

³Ibid., p. 16.

⁴Ibid., p. 17.

of a scientific attitude on the part of principals and general supervisors, about 1920, gave them a common ground on which to work out co-operative procedures. The supervisors who based procedures on scientific principles could introduce procedures with confidence; principals who were acquainted with objective methods were able to co-operate without feeling of a loss of individuality or independence.

Principals and Special Supervisors Prior to 1900

Introduction of special teachers into school systems.-

Cincinnati was one of the first school systems to employ teachers of special subjects. In 1842, the following passage appeared in the Report of the Common Schools:

"James W. Bowers, Teacher of Penmanship (at \$45 per mo.) gives lessons $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours each, at least twice a week, to select classes, in all Districts, (visiting four hours each day) and aids the Principal Instructors, as far as practicable, in the superintendence of all the writers under their immediate charge."¹

Two special teachers of music were appointed in 1845.² Special teachers of music were introduced into the Boston Schools in 1858.³ Music was taught in the Chicago Schools as early as 1850, and in 1865 the teachers of music received the same salary as district principals.⁴

In 1859, regulations were adopted governing the relations between principals and the special teacher of handwriting in Cincinnati. These were very simple. The special teacher apportioned her time between schools according to her judgment of the needs, and reported the time so spent to the principals.⁵ The following year, regulations were adopted requiring principal and music teacher to co-operate in designating teachers to give daily instruction in vocal music. The music teacher was to supervise the instruction of the teachers and the principal was responsible for the amount of time to be devoted to music.⁶ In 1866, a regulation

¹Thirteenth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1842, p. 16.

²Sixteenth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1845, p. 7.

³Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1858, p.7.

⁴Eleventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1865, p. 11.

⁵Thirty-first Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1860, p. 87.

⁶Ibid., p. 95.

provided that the music teachers and superintendent, in consultation with the principal, were to arrange the time at which music lessons were given at the various schools.¹ Four music teachers and one writing teacher were employed in 1872. Their duties were prescribed as visiting schools, giving special lessons, and supervising the work of their special departments.²

Special teachers were employed for other subjects which were winning a place in the curriculum of the elementary schools. Drawing was put on the list of grammar school studies in Boston in 1848, but it was not taught widely until after 1856, when drawing teachers assigned to the normal school and high schools began to supervise the drawing in the grammar schools. In 1871, a supervisor of drawing was appointed,³ and drawing was taken up in earnest in all schools of Boston. Providence likewise appointed a supervisor of drawing in 1872.⁴ Special teachers of sewing were introduced in Providence in 1868,⁵ and in Boston shortly after 1869.⁶ In 1882, a special teacher was employed for manual training in Boston grammar schools.⁷ Cleveland, in 1873, had supervisors in drawing, handwriting, physical education, and primary instruction.⁸ St. Louis had supervisors of kindergarten in 1890.⁹

Early salaries.- The salaries of teachers and supervisors in the special subjects sometimes equalled those of principals, but were usually somewhat lower. In 1869, for example, the maximum salary of principals in Cincinnati was \$1900; those of music teachers, the gymnastic teachers, and the Principal of

¹Twelfth Annual Report, St. Louis, op. cit., p. xxxv (appendix).

²Eighteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1872, p. 162.

³Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1929, pp. 192-93.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee of Providence, 1901, p. 134.

⁵Ibid., p. 134.

⁶Annual Report, 1929, op. cit., p. 194.

⁷Ibid., p. 197.

⁸Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1883, p. 60.

⁹Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1891, p. 14.

Drawing were \$1800.¹ In 1873, the maximum salary of principals in Washington, D. C., was \$2000 and that of the special teacher of drawing was \$1200.²

Responsibility for early direction of the special subjects.- Principals in New York were expected to participate more extensively in the supervision of the special subjects during this period than were principals of many other large cities. In 1873, Assistant Superintendent Jasper recommended that administration of a graded system of drawing be made obligatory for principals.³ In the same year, a committee on the course of study recommended that regular class teachers, under the direction and supervision of principals and special music teachers, should aid in music instruction, and that the entire work should be supervised and tested by a competent person appointed for that specific purpose.⁴ This policy was adopted the following year, an assistant superintendent being made responsible for music instruction in the elementary schools.⁵ Lack of definition of the principal's role in supervising music was pointed out in the following excerpt from the report of Assistant Superintendent Harrison in 1876:

"I have carefully consulted the principals in order to obtain their views in regard to the instruction in music. These views are very various. Some have entered heartily into the plan of class-room reviews. Others find the pressure of other subjects upon the limited time too great to allow such reviews. Most advise that the music be definitely graded, and that the specific requirements be inserted under each grade in the course of study, and in the Teachers' Manual. To this advice, in which I heartily concur, I would add that the By-Laws of the Board should more clearly define the principals' and class-teachers' positions in regard to the teaching and review of music; that this subject should be made an element in the examinations of candidates for teachers' licenses; and that the schools should be subjected to a frequent examination

¹Fortieth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1870, p. 206.

²Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Washington, 1873, p. 314.

³Thirty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 314.

⁴Ibid., pp. 248-49.

⁵Thirty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1874, pp. 262-63.

in music by an expert."¹

That principals in those days, as well as principals of the present day, were sometimes willing to let the special teachers assume full responsibility for special subjects, is evidenced by the following passage:

"In some schools, the principals take an active interest, and the work of the special teacher is reviewed and often supplemented by the teachers of the classes. In such cases real progress has been made and good work done. On the other hand, there are schools where, for various reasons, the principals take little or no direct interest in the study, and the class teachers are too diffident, or can find no time to assist by reviewing the work of the special teacher. In such schools, the time given to the study of music is virtually lost. From these and other causes, it sometimes happens that the results actually accomplished by the same special teacher will grade "excellent" in one school and "fair" in another. It is to be regretted that the various responsibilities of the principals, special teachers, and class teachers, in relation to the music, are not yet definitely established by authority."²

In 1884, the effectiveness with which principals and regular teachers in New York managed the subject of handwriting was made the subject of special comment by the Superintendent.³ Two years later, he recommended that no further special teachers in music and drawing be appointed.⁴ In 1887, the President of the Board in Chicago recommended abolishing special teachers, arguing that regular teachers could do the work just as well.⁵ In New York, the policy recommended by the Superintendent was adopted in 1889. In 1892, the responsibility of principals in New York for the planning, programming, and supervision of the work in music was emphasized in the Superintendent's report.⁶ The principals were requested the same year, to evaluate the results of

¹Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1876, p. 152.

²Thirty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 176-77.

³Forty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1884, p. 169.

⁴Forty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 158.

⁵Thirty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1887, pp. 23-25.

⁶Fifty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1892, p. 140.

instruction in physical education in the elementary schools.

In St. Louis, for some years prior to 1885, the supervisors of music appeared to have, or at least to assume, full responsibility for instruction in their subject. In a joint report in 1885, the supervisors stated that instruction in music was intrusted to them, that the regular teachers were expected to conduct lessons during visits of the supervisors, unless those officials chose to do it themselves, and that the supervisors judged the work done between visits and advised the teachers on improvement of methods. The supervisors also examined the pupils at the close of each year.¹ The President of the Board stated in 1887 that notwithstanding the "prevalence of the fashion" of teaching some subjects by specialists, St. Louis steadfastly held to the opinion that regular teachers should direct all English studies pursued in their rooms.² Supervisors of drawing pointed out in 1890 that principals in St. Louis rendered great aid in securing drawing materials, frequently at their own expense.³

Supervisors of manual training, sewing, kindergarten work, physical education, and cooking were provided for New York City in a special school law passed in 1895. Numerous conferences of all supervisors of special subjects, principals, and assistant superintendents were reported in 1896, at which plans for the instruction and guidance of teachers in the special subjects were formulated.⁴ A musician of national reputation was made superintendent of music, with the object of co-ordinating music instruction and activities throughout the schools.⁵

Supervision of German in the elementary grades.- Supervision of German in the elementary schools of large cities prior to 1900 merits attention in any discussion of the relations of principals to special supervisors. Such cities as Cincinnati, New York, Chicago, and Cleveland placed considerable emphasis on instruction in German in the grades, often employing a large staff of special teachers and full-time supervisors. In some cities, assistant superintendents devoted all of their attention

¹Thirty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1885, pp. 194-98.

²Thirty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1890, p. 58.

³Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1890, p. 58.

⁴Fifty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1896, p. 141.

⁵Ibid., p. 55.

in the direction of instruction in German.¹ The highly technical nature of the subject, and its temporary tenure in the elementary grades placed it outside the category of traditional special subjects in the elementary school, but its early advent as a subject requiring special treatment undoubtedly made it a factor in the relations of principals and special supervisors. While specific evidence in this particular is lacking, the fact that special teachers of German were required to devote their time to holding meetings of teachers, directing methods of teaching, and promoting pupils in German classes² probably influenced principals, in many instances, to consider other subjects as also requiring the direction of special teachers and supervisors.³

Little evidence appeared in official reports regarding friction between principals and special supervisors prior to 1900; indeed, there were few pronouncements regarding the relationship which should exist between the two official groups. It is possible that the numerous pronouncements made by superintendents and observed by general supervisors, regarding the principal as the responsible head of his school, were considered as applying to special supervisors also. However, Superintendent Soldan of St. Louis, in 1898, covered the case for special supervisors in discussing the functions of supervisors of primary grades. Collision of authority, he stated, could be easily avoided by the use of common sense. It was the duty of all to get along with co-workers. The whole system of management in St. Louis was based on the idea of the principal's responsibility for all details of work in his school. Differences of opinion, he concluded, were to be adjusted by conference of principal with the superintendent.⁴

Development from 1900 to 1918

The Chicago experiment.- By 1900, the status of the special subjects in the curriculums of large cities was such that superintendents were obliged to formulate definite policies regarding their supervision. The situation differed considerably from

¹Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1863, pp. 106-29.

²Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1881, p. 17.

³Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1879, p. 169.

⁴Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 152-53.

the situation in the eighties and nineties, owing to the fact that normal schools were now turning out teachers trained in the teaching of music and drawing. Also, teachers in service were taking extension classes. In Chicago, for example, in 1905, 709 teachers¹ were enrolled in extension art classes, and 593 in music classes. It became a choice between having large corps of special teachers and supervisors, or assigning the responsibility for the special subjects to the regular teachers and the principals. In 1903, Superintendent Cooley of Chicago enumerated the steps which he had taken to make the principals responsible for all the work of their schools: (1) administrative work formerly done by special teachers was assigned to principals and district superintendents, (2) special teachers devoted their time to preparing outlines, holding teachers institutes, and inspecting work in the school, and (3) special teachers weekly reported results of inspections to the superintendent who endeavored to keep district superintendents and principals acquainted with the situation in the special subjects, so that remedial work might be employed where needed. This policy, according to Cooley, resulted in reducing the friction that often arose between principal and special teacher under the old relation, in making the efforts of principal and teachers with respect to the special subjects more intelligent, and in increasing the interest of both teachers and pupils in the special subjects.²

The following year, Superintendent Cooley, in discussing results of the supervision of music, asserted that the work of the year "manifested the importance of the function of the principal." Where the principal was able to supervise carefully the work in music, whether he was musical or not, great enthusiasm for the subject was shown by pupils and teachers. Since music teachers were able to get to the schools only once or twice yearly, the interest of the principal was essential to good work.³ In drawing, the special teachers, during visits to schools, observed lessons given by the teachers and inspected work done in intervals between visits. They stood ready to make helpful suggestions to principals, and when requested by the principals, they held meetings in the buildings to amplify suggestions made to teachers and principals. Nevertheless, the Superintendent felt that the work in drawing was not in every case up to the standard of previous years. The new supervisory policy necessitated a deep interest

¹Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1905, p. 169.

²Forty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 53.

³Fiftieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1904, p. 119.

on the part of the principal in drawing, and wherever this was shown, the work compared favorably with that under the old plan. When principals showed interest in the work and a desire to co-operate with the special teacher, work of a high order was accomplished.¹

The attitude of the principals of Chicago with respect to administering the special subjects was voiced by a committee of the Chicago Principals' Association. The report emphasized the specialization of the teaching of music and drawing. After pointing out that more than one-fourth of the schools of the city were then utilizing departmentalization in the special subjects, and that certain teachers were "deficient by nature in Music or Drawing," while others were superior in these subjects, the committee recommended the following plan:

"1. That one or more teachers apt in teaching Music, also one or more in Drawing, be selected by the principal of each school out of the corps of that school, and upon the approval of the Superintendent be given departmental teaching of these subjects not to exceed half time.

"2. That the work of the special teachers of music and drawing be directed toward instructing and inspiring the departmental and class teachers and principals.

"3. That, for this purpose frequent institutes be held where the special teacher will meet all the teachers of a large school, of several small schools, or certain grades, or the departmental teachers of Drawing or Music.

"4. That the class-room visitation be much curtailed and for the purpose, mainly, of furnishing illustrative lessons for the guidance of teachers.

"5. That the work of the special teacher so far as it relates to a particular school be under the direction of the principal of that school, subject to the control of the Superintendent.

"It will be far more effective for the special teachers to deal with 500 or 600 departmental teachers instead of 5,500 grade teachers as at present. This plan would call for the discontinuation of visits by the special teachers to each and every schoolroom of the city, and therefore provide for an increase in the number of visits to the several schools and a shortening of the period of these visits. It is believed that this more frequent visitation and counsel will enhance the efficiency of the service and obviate the need of any addition

¹Ibid., pp. 117-18.

to the present number of special teachers. The departmental teacher and the specialization of one school corps are way-marks of advance in the profession of teaching."¹

The progress of Superintendent Cooley's plan during the period 1903-1908 is worthy of special attention. It appeared to be a continual struggle to get principals at that stage in the development of the principalship to devote appropriate attention and study to the special subjects, and to utilize adequately the services of the special teachers and departments. In 1905, Superintendent Cooley, in referring to the weekly reports made to him by the special supervisors, invited attention to the fact that supervision of drawing by principals was uneven, that they did not always see that the pupils were supplied with books, and that they did not see that the plans of the course were consistently carried out. The School Board, the Superintendent continued, was, like him, fully convinced that the special subjects should be on the same footing as the other subjects. Where drawing and music under the new plan were weak, it was usually found that the other subjects were weak also. On the whole, the Superintendent felt, the probability was that the special subjects were taught as well as the traditional subjects and that there was no special reason for returning to a system which would increase the number of peripatetic teachers interested in only one subject. If good correlated work was ever to be done in the schools, the principal and his teachers would have to be responsible for the entire curriculum, utilizing special teachers as needed. As aids to the policy, the superintendent recommended the taking of extension courses by principals and teachers, and the departmentalization of the work in the special subjects.²

In 1905, and again in 1906, reference was made to the feeling, in certain quarters, that more drawing teachers should be employed in the Chicago Schools. In 1907, the drawing teachers met as a group to discuss the apportionment of supplies and the standards of work. They also accepted an invitation to meet the committee of the Principal's Association on drawing, and in accordance with wishes expressed by the principals' committee, revised the outlines in drawing previously provided for teachers' guidance.³ In 1908, toward the close of Superintendent Cooley's administration, two new drawing teachers were added. This action

¹Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, op. cit., p. 169.

²Fifty-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 117-18.

³Fifty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1907, p. 177.

was apparently contrary to the wishes of the superintendent. He complained that though great sums were spent for special teachers, music, drawing, and the like continued to be regarded as fads. These subjects, he argued, were "not luxuries, but necessities in education," and they should be so incorporated into the work that they would be taught, like the "Three Rs," under the direction of the principals. He criticised the normal schools for not enlarging their point of view with respect to training teachers in the special subjects.¹

In 1910, under a new superintendent, the policy of depending mainly on principals for supervision of the special subjects was modified. Five special teachers of music were added, and the number of special teachers of drawing was increased to ten. The opinion was expressed that drawing and physical education required closer supervision than music.² Superintendent Young pointed out in 1913 that schools needed more than supervisors looking after certain subjects; and that balance of subjects and values must be maintained if the school was to be a civic force in the community.³ Two years later, however, she expressed herself as unreservedly in favor of supervision by special supervisors rather than by principals. An excerpt from her statement reads as follows:

"Occasionally one hears comment on the large number of supervisors in Chicago. There are nine. Each is assisted by special teachers or grade teachers

"Years ago, I thought it possible to conduct all subjects through the supervision of the superintendents and principals, but experience and observation do not support my theory. Those subjects which were not a vital part of the school training of a principal are seldom cultivated or developed as under the care of a specialist, occasionally the exception exists, but rarely. I have slowly come to the conclusion that our kindergartens as a rule are not moving along with the general educational advance - they do not have special supervision."⁴

Thus ended the twelve-year trial in Chicago of supervision of special subjects by principals. The evidence appears to place the responsibility for the failure squarely on the shoulders of

¹Fifty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1908, p. 227.

²Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1910, p. 78.

³Fifty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 104.

⁴Sixtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1915, p. 19.

the principals. They were either unprepared professionally, or unwilling at that time, to assume the same responsibility for the special subjects as for the traditional subjects.

Relative increase in numbers of special supervisors.- The variation in numbers of special teachers in certain subjects as compared with numbers of elementary principals in New York over a period of years is shown in Table III. Cooking, shopwork, and

TABLE III

NUMBER OF SPECIAL TEACHERS OF MUSIC, DRAWING, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, SEWING, AND HANDWRITING, AND NUMBER OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS, IN NEW YORK IN 1904, 1908, AND 1912

Special Teachers	1904	1908	1912	Increase 1904-1912
Music	49	50	52	3
Drawing	51	51	48	- 3
Physical Education	21	31	33	12
Sewing	55	62	61	6
Handwriting	1	1	-	- 1
Total	177	195	194	17
Principals	410	425	419	9

German were not included in the table because they were taught directly by the special teachers. The data show that during the eight-year period, the number of special teachers increased 9.6 per cent, whereas the number of elementary school principals increased only 2.2 per cent. With the exception of physical education, no marked change was made in numbers of supervisors in any of the categories. Considerable comment regarding the supervisory load of special teachers in New York was made during this period. In 1907, the superintendent invited attention to the fact that in physical education there were only thirty special teachers for the forty-six school districts. He recommended the appointment of twenty more special teachers of physical education,¹ but his request was apparently unheeded. In 1908, the special teachers of drawing had as many as 250 classes and 10,000 pupils,² and music

¹Ninth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1907, p. 35.

²Tenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 466.

teachers as high as 350 to 400 classes, to supervise.¹

During the same period in which Superintendent Cooley of Chicago was striving to establish principals as supervisors of special subjects, Superintendent Maxwell of New York was also giving special attention to supervision of the special subjects. However, Maxwell appeared to regard the supervision of special subjects as a more difficult problem than Cooley regarded it. He did not place so much faith in the instruction which teachers received in the normal school in the special subjects;² he believed that the teaching of these branches was "still in its infancy."³ His policy, as expressed in 1909, was slowly to increase the staff of supervisory teachers, and have principals utilize the services of teachers with exceptional talent by departmentalizing the work in the special subjects.⁴

Superintendent Maxwell defined the relationship between principal and special supervisor in a circular to the supervising force in 1910, as follows:

"Special teachers shall at each visit confer with the principal and with the local supervisor, and receive information, preferably written, as to the teachers requiring special assistance, and the nature of the assistance required. As far as it is necessary and advisable, the local supervisor should visit with the special teacher such classes as are in special need of supervision.

"At the close of the school the special teacher should confer with the local supervisor and indicate the results of her visits. During the interval between the special teacher's visits, the local supervisor should visit the classes requiring special assistance and should indicate the results of such supervision to the special teacher upon her return.

"Special conferences for the grade, department or school should be arranged in consultation with the principal.

"Special teachers will hold office hours at a school conveniently located in the district, according to a schedule which will be placed in the hands of the principal, and the principal will require attendance of his teachers at the office of the special teachers when it is in his opinion

¹Ibid., p. 484.

²Twelfth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1910, p. 125.

³Eleventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1909, p. 46.

⁴Ibid., pp. 46-47.

necessary and advisable for the teachers to receive additional instruction, in which case the special teacher will return a report of such visit to the principal of the school."¹

Varied aspects of the relations between principal and special supervisor.- Problems sometimes arose over the amount and kind of supplies ordered for the special subjects. Directors of special departments in New York criticized the methods used by principals in ordering supplies, for music² (1902), and for drawing³ (1905). The district superintendents in New York according to provisions of the Charter, assigned special teachers to the various schools. In 1905, special teachers of physical education in Chicago visited schools on call of the principals,⁴ and in 1909, principals in New York were required to fix rest periods for special teachers of physical education to the amount of one-half hour each day.⁵ That the Child Study Department of Chicago Schools furnish teachers of subnormal divisions with their daily programs, and give examinations for promotion of pupils to the regular rooms, was recommended in 1910 by the superintendent in charge of subnormal divisions.⁶ Principals in Chicago were advised in 1911 that they should plan the work in manual training in conjunction with manual training teachers,⁷ and in 1913, that they should select equipment for subnormal rooms.⁸

Practices in years immediately preceding 1918.- The situation in Chicago with respect to the relationship between principals and special supervisors has already been discussed. In 1915, Superintendent Maxwell of New York quoted in his annual report from the opinion of Examiner Byrnes regarding the qualifications of teachers and principals for directing instruction in the special subjects. It was still the opinion that the great body of teachers were qualified "in some measure" to teach special branches, but that they still needed the instruction of "skilled

¹Twelfth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 226-27.

²Fourth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1902, p. 101.

³Seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 310.

⁴Fifty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 116.

⁵Eleventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 465.

⁶Fifty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 107.

⁷Fifty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 126.

⁸Fifty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 189.

supervisors." The belief was also held that it was not reasonable to expect principals to be able to supervise the special subjects:

"If these officials were fully qualified in all these special branches, they could perform the services now rendered by the special teachers. We cannot hope to make all our grade teachers specialists in these branches; neither can we anticipate a corps of supervising officials who are encyclopedic in knowledge and 'Admirable Crichtons' in respect to personal attainments in the special arts."¹

Apparently the ideas that the same general educational principles which applied in the general subjects could also be applied in the special subjects, and that a high degree of technical knowledge was not necessary for supervising the special subjects in the elementary grades, had not yet become prevalent in the reasoning of the higher educational officials in New York.

St. Louis, in 1916, made the principal responsible "for the whole training of the child," and professed satisfaction with the policy of placing the special subjects, as well as the others, under the control of the principal. Special supervisors were required to confer with the principal, before going to rooms, as to where attention was most needed, and before leaving the school, regarding the condition of the work in the special subject, the progress noted, and the rooms which needed the principal's attention.²

Development After 1918

Practices in New York City.- The principal was qualified according to the Director of Special Divisions in New York City, to care for routine factors which contributed to the success of instruction, curriculum problems, analysis of conduct disorders, and general social problems arising in connection with the work of such classes.³ What prevented principals from becoming students of child psychology and case work for problem children, and putting the results of such study into practice, was not stated. Special teachers were expected to give technical information and advice to general supervisors in 1926.⁴ The teaching of music

¹Seventeenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1915, pp. 178-79.

²Sixty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 276.

³Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 285-86.

⁴Ibid., p. 49.

in Grades 7-9 was done by teachers having special certificates in the subject; in Grades 1-6 by the home room teachers. One special teacher was provided for each 400 regular teachers.¹ A request from the Director of Kindergarten for additional supervisors was rejected by the Superintendent on the ground that principals were becoming better informed regarding kindergarten instruction.² A committee was appointed by the superintendent in 1929 for the purpose of studying and reporting on the need for additional special teachers and the extent to which training school graduates were equipped to teach the special subjects without special supervision. It was the finding of the committee (1) that training school graduates were adequately prepared to teach the special subjects, but that they represented approximately sixty per cent of the staff, (2) that while principals supervise the work in the special subjects, they leave the technical aspects of the work to the trained supervisors, and (3) that the need for special teachers was clear. The bases recommended for the employment of special teachers in Grades 1-6 were a ratio of one special teacher to each 300 classes and a minimum of three visits per term to each class.³ These standards were high compared to the current situation. Actually each special teacher had 900 or more classroom teachers to visit during a term.⁴ They were also high compared to current conditions in Chicago where each special teacher of music made six visits to schools during the year, and was expected to assist an average of 790 teachers.⁵

Practices in St. Louis.- The employment of a number of subject supervisors in St. Louis has already been mentioned in connection with general supervision. The supervisory force in 1929 consisted of:

1 Supervisor of Kindergartens	1 Supervisor of Household Arts
2 Supervisors of Primary work	1 Supervisor of Physical Education and seven assistants
1 Supervisor of Apprentice and Substitutes	1 Supervisor of Health and one

¹Ibid., p. 267.

²Ibid., p. 266.

³Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 83.

⁴Thirty-first Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1929, p. 354.

⁵Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1925, p.112.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1 Supervisor of Drawing and
six assistants. | assistant. |
| 1 Supervisor of Music and
nine assistants. | 1 Supervisor of Safety Work. |
| 1 Supervisor of Manual Arts. | 1 Supervisor of Penmanship and
three assistants. |
| 1 Supervisor of Physical and
Biological Sciences. | 1 Supervisor of English. |
| 1 Supervisor of Commercial
subjects. | 1 Supervisor of Social Sciences. |
| 1 Supervisor of Special Schools. | 1 Supervisor of Foreign Language
work. |
| | 1 Supervisor of School Gardens. |
| | 1 Assistant Superintendent in
charge. ¹ |

With the purpose of co-ordinating supervision in all subjects, the assistant superintendent in charge of supervision at the beginning of each year held meetings of the assistant superintendent in charge of elementary schools, the district superintendents, and the primary and kindergarten supervisors. The chief supervisor of a given subject was also required to attend the meetings. This official was asked to state to the group the aims and objectives of his work, what he expected to accomplish through his supervision and how he wanted to accomplish it, his views on the merits and defects of the course of study, the attitude of principals toward his supervision, the co-operation the principals gave him, and the problems which he encountered in the various schools.² Such data usually formed the bases of discussion at the meetings.

The special supervisors were not permitted to make changes in the methods and activities utilized by teachers in their subjects, but suggested changes to the principal. If he approved the changes suggested by the supervisor, he put them into effect. The special supervisors did not rate teachers but aided the principal in doing so when requested. The special supervisor was expected to show in all of his actions that the express purpose of his visit was to act as an expert assistant to the principal in carrying out the latter's policies. The first duty of the supervisor on visiting a school, was to confer with the principal regarding his plans for the subject. His next duty was to make a complete survey of the work in the subject, and report important findings to the principal. The two officials were then expected to formulate a program setting forth the part that each was to play, the principal's decisions being final on all issues. The special supervisor was expected to remain at a school several days, if necessary, to get his part of the program well under way, and

¹Seventy-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1929, p. 24.

²Seventy-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 15.

before leaving, was required to make a complete report to the principal. On his next visit, he took up the program where advised by the principal. The old program was revised, or a new program was formulated. Keeping the principal and his staff well supplied with professional literature on his subject was also regarded as an important function of the supervisor.¹

A picture of an assistant superintendent striving to co-ordinate the work of principal and special supervisor is furnished by the following passage:

"Observing the work of the supervisors in the schools.-

On my visits to the schools with supervisors and their assistants, I had a conference with the principal and the supervisor. We discussed the condition of the work supervised, the attitude of the teachers to supervision, the co-operation given by the teachers, the way the principal followed up the progress of the work between the visits of the supervisor. I ascertained to what extent the principal considered the supervisor's work a help to him in his efforts to raise the standard of the work to the highest possible level and if he looked upon the supervisor as the expert in his subject and whether he called him to the school in addition to the regular visits whenever he felt that his help was needed. I then went with the supervisor and, in all cases where the principal could lay aside his other work, with him into the classroom to see how the supervisor conducted his work. After each visit to a classroom, I discussed with the supervisor and the principal what we had observed as to the work of teacher and supervisor and what could be done to make the work of both more effect-
ual."²

Summary

The main developments in the relations of principal and special supervisor after 1918 may be summarized as (1) the improvement of techniques of co-operation between principal and special supervisor during the latter's visits to schools, (2) the recognition of the fact that the principal should supervise the work in the special subjects, with the special teacher acting as a technical expert, and (3) the policy of holding the principal responsible for the effective use of the special teachers as expert advisers in supervision. School authorities in large cities appeared to be convinced that regular teachers, as a

¹Ibid., pp. 16-17.

²Seventy-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 22.

group, were not yet sufficiently trained in the special subjects to permit principals to dispense altogether with the services of special supervisors.

CHAPTER VI

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL AS A COMMUNITY LEADER

The earliest recorded responsibilities of principals with respect to their school communities were regulations prescribed by school boards for the purpose of facilitating the discipline of the pupils or protecting boards from complaints of citizens. They were not policies initiated by principals to gain community co-operation in improving the work of the school. For example, principals in the Boston schools were authorized in 1857 to prevent agents from entering schools to advertise or sell articles, and to forbid the posting of bills on school walls or fences.¹ Principals in Chicago were required in 1858 to sign report cards to parents giving averages of pupils in attendance, deportment, and scholarship.² Board rules in force in Chicago in 1865 required that principals provide an early room for pupils coming early in cold or stormy weather, see that school clocks were regulated with city time, and that such time be used by teachers in recording attendance of pupils, report on books provided from the special fund for indigent pupils, refuse admittance to pupils not vaccinated, and send home pupils not clean in person or dress.³ Truant officers in Boston in 1880 were required to bring to the attention of principals all cases of scarlet fever or other contagious diseases discovered in the community.⁴ Principals in New York in 1885 were required to report children 8-14 years old in the community who were not attending school, and keep record of the disposition of each case.⁵

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1857,
p. 280.

²Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1858, pp. 51-52.

³Eleventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1865, p. 24.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1880,
p. 261.

⁵Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1885, p. 141.

The dedication of new school buildings was an occasion during the latter half of the Nineteenth Century, for contact by the principal with officials of the city and immediate community. This was especially true in Boston, where prominent citizens and city officials made speeches and the mayor of the city presented the principal with the keys of the school. The principal usually made a speech on the local aims of the school and invited the co-operation of parents in attaining these aims.¹ Principals appeared to play a less important role in the annual school festival, for beyond presiding at "collations" for the pupils of the highest classes of their respective schools, they were not mentioned in reports of these gatherings.² However, when the public schools honored Admiral Dewey with a parade and reception on his visit to Boston in 1899, the Superintendent of Schools expressed his pleasure that fifty-six of the fifty-seven grammar masters participated, the absent member being on leave. A grammar master, moreover, acted as grand marshal of the event.³

Community Leadership of Principals Prior to 1900

Pioneer work with mothers' clubs.- Principals were the first school officials to sense the advantages of organizing patrons to support projects initiated in the schools. Many of the earliest projects for which parental support was sought dealt with factors of pupil welfare, such as health and recreation. The social purpose behind the first moves to organize parents may be a partial explanation for the fact that women principals showed a special interest in this field. The first outstanding example of parental organization occurred in Detroit in 1894, when Principal Harriet Marsh of the Hancock School organized the Hancock Mothers' Club. According to the statement of Superintendent Robinson in 1897, comparison of the statistics of the school during the previous two years with those of the school for former years, and with neighboring schools, showed that percentages of truancy, absence, and contagious diseases in the school had been lessened, supporting Miss Marsh's claim that improvement in these particulars had been a direct result of the Mothers' Club. The

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1869,
pp. 328-29.

²Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1870,
p. 280.

³Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1899,
p. 37.

indirect influences, though not measurable were, in the opinion of the Superintendent, "far reaching." The club was well known throughout the city and the State, but the Superintendent received so many letters from Superintendents and teachers regarding mothers' meetings that he asked Miss Marsh to write a report of the organization, growth, and policies of the Hancock Mothers' Club from its inception to the current year. The report was published in full by the Superintendent. After explaining that interest in the subject of child study, and the feeling that the two greatest trainers of the child - mother and teacher - should be brought as close together as possible, the conditions under which the first meeting was held were described in the following passage:

"It was with some such thoughts as these, coupled with others even more serious, that the principal of the Hancock School issued little mimeographed copies of an invitation requesting parents to meet a certain Thursday afternoon in October, 1894, to consider the needs of the family in which all were so mutually interested, for at this time the district was much distraught by the religious and political questions of the day; the parents, intelligent, hard working and anxious, were keenly alert; the newly appointed principal, naturally came in for her share of the universal distrust, and an immediate unification of all elements in the study of some central object was eminently necessary to the well-being of the school. Thursday came, so did twenty-four mothers, who listened in a sort of patient surprise, while I explained the object of the meeting and distributed a set of simple questions from Dr. Hall's syllabus on "Dolls" for study during the month."

In addition to the benefits gained by the study and discussion of formal topics, Principal Marsh cited the clearing up of points involving discipline, such as tardiness, destruction of property, and cigarette smoking by older boys. Meetings were always held in the school, and the club had no constitution or by-laws, in order to keep meetings as informal as possible. The principal commended the mothers' club as a means of uniting a neighborhood disturbed by religious or civil strife, through the common interest in children's welfare.¹

Topics discussed in the monthly meetings of 1895-96 dealt with the service of the public school to the child, the connection between good health and good mentality and morality, the effect of different foods upon the body, intemperance in drinking, eating,

¹Fifty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Detroit, 1897, pp. 91-94.

and pleasure, diseases, children's falsehoods, purity of children's conversation, foods and diet, teaching children unselfishness, and child welfare during vacation. The topics for 1896-97 were concerned with the school and the mothers, care of the eyes, care of the skin, mothers' privileges, self-government of children, care of children, children's rights, care of adolescent girls, care of the ear, and children's punishments.¹

An outgrowth of the Hancock Mothers' Club was the organization of the Mothers' Congress of Michigan in Detroit, May 3-4, 1898.² Principal Marsh was made the first president of the state organization. Her annual reports on the work of the Hancock Mothers' Club continued to be a feature of the annual reports of the superintendent. The programs of ensuing years, while still emphasizing child study and health topics, began to show a trend toward civic topics, such as care and decoration of school building and grounds, the place of the individual in the community, and keeping streets clean. Mothers' clubs were organized, as a result of Miss Marsh's leadership, in many cities, and she was frequently honored by invitations to address gatherings of superintendents on co-operation between schools and their local communities.³

Early efforts to utilize community agencies for improvement of instruction.- As early as 1881, principals secured the co-operation of public libraries as a means of providing sets of books for supplementary reading in the schools, and their action resulted in moves to bring about city-wide co-operation between library trustees and boards of education.⁴ In 1898, a principal enlisted the interest of a citizens' organization in sewing and cooking classes initiated in his school, and secured its help in enlisting the support of the Board of Education for work of this type in the schools.⁵

Attitude of superintendents toward local community leadership.- It was not until the late nineties that superintendents

¹Ibid., pp. 95-104.

²Fifty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Detroit, 1898, p. 68.

³Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Detroit, 1899, p. 132-59.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1881, p. 27.

⁵Forty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1898, p. 58.

officially expressed interest in local community support of schools. This seeming lack of interest may have been due either to special emphasis by superintendents on city-wide support for their own policies or to their apprehension lest principals become too strongly entrenched in their districts or wards. Superintendent Soldan of St. Louis was one of the first superintendents to point out the advantages of good community response to the activities of the school, and how such response could best be obtained. He placed the responsibility almost entirely on the principal. Writing in 1898 on the topic "Principal and Community," he pointed out that favorable reaction by the people of the community made the work of principals and teachers lighter, and at the same time more effective. To secure the desired community co-operation, he advised that the principal (1) make his school efficient in instruction and discipline, (2) make good use of his daily opportunities to form acquaintances with the citizens of his district, and (3) see that he and the teachers systematically cultivated pleasant relations with parents. Pleasant relations with parents, Superintendent Soldan continued, did not mean that the principal should comply with unreasonable demands, or show politic weakness, but even a refusal by the principal could be put in a form which would appeal to the petitioner. Above all, every parent should be made to feel "absolutely sure of a courteous and respectful hearing," and even angry parents should be received "with good-natured patience and forbearance." Every visitor should leave the school, in Soldan's opinion, with the impression that principal and teachers had the interests of the pupils at heart, and the manifest desire to satisfy just demands.¹

Forerunners of social centers.- Receptions for parents and entertainments with illustrated lectures were arranged in some school systems by principals.² In one instance two rooms of a school were equipped with electric lights and kept open one evening each week, in order that pupils whose home conditions did not permit study might work under the guidance of the principal or a teacher designated by him.³

School baths.- An outstanding pioneer in community leadership was Principal L. H. Dutton of the Paul Revere School of Boston. One of his achievements was the introduction of baths in the grammar schools in 1899. According to Superintendent Seaver,

¹Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1898, pp. 80-81.

²Forty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1899, p. 177.

³Annual Report, Boston, 1899, op. cit., p. 27.

Dutton had long advocated the establishment of baths, and from the first, the experiment was a success. Between 125 and 150 pupils otherwise deprived of this essential health privilege enjoyed the baths daily during the first year following their establishment at the Revere School.¹ On the death of Dutton in 1904, the Superintendent called attention to the remarkable knowledge of the people of his district which this principal had possessed,² and his effective utilization of this knowledge in their service.

Community Leadership of Principals from 1900 to 1918

Meeting local needs.- Vacation schools were opened in Boston in 1900. Principals were prominent in advocating this activity and a principal was made general director of vacation-school work.³ In 1901, the activities of principals and their staffs in advertising to parents the advantages of the flexible system of promotions recently introduced, and the importance of keeping pupils in school until education was relatively completed, were credited by the Superintendent of Schools in St. Louis with improving the holding power of the schools.⁴ Every principal consulted regarding the provisions of a proposed course of study, according to the report of Superintendent Maxwell in 1901, demanded a course "sufficiently flexible to be adapted to the needs of any neighborhood,"⁵ an indication that principals were giving attention to conditions and needs of their school communities. The following year, the Superintendent reported that greater freedom had been accorded principals in adapting the work of their schools to the needs of localities.⁶

The principal's role in establishing social centers.- One of the earliest references to the opportunities of principals for making their schools social centers was that of Superintendent

¹Ibid., pp. 29-30.

²Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1904, p. 64.

³Annual Report of the Schools Committee of Boston, 1900, pp. 10-12.

⁴Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1901, p. 28.

⁵Third Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1901, p. 89.

⁶Fourth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1902, p. 125.

Seaver in 1902. In introducing the topic, he wrote as follows:

"Finally, there is an interesting matter which may be regarded by the principal of a school district, not so much in the light of an imperative duty as in that of an opportunity of privilege. He can, if he will, do much towards awakening and concentrating the interest of the parents and older friends of the pupils in the work going on in the schools. The kindergarten teachers have already done good service in this direction through their Mothers' meetings and their visits to the homes of the children. This kind of service could be extended by teachers of the primary and higher grades; indeed, it has already been so extended in a few districts, though not so much as might be easily supposed possible and desirable."¹

Continuing, Seaver stated that a society in the city met once or twice during the year to discuss ways in which the school and home could be brought into more intimate and helpful relations, but that so far the ideas expressed had found little local expression. What was needed, in his opinion, was a society in every school district, holding frequent meetings and adapting its program to suit the needs of the locality. Though educational topics, if interestingly presented, might be included in the program, the social feature of the meetings should be kept uppermost. Difficulties in organizing social life in a school district of a large city, such as the facts that principal and teachers often lived out of the district, that many residents found their social life in other parts of the city, and that, unlike in a village school district, families in city neighborhoods often lived in social isolation from each other, were recognized by Seaver, but he was confident that if parental interest in school children were taken as a basis, and that the people felt that the initiative and responsibility for arrangements were their own, an interesting and helpful social life might be built up about the school. He concluded as follows:

"I have said that the experiment of making the schools social centers would be well worth making. It ought to be added that some experiments of this kind have been made already; and the finest opportunity for making more such experiments seems to be afforded by the encouragement now given to the idea of making a more extended use of school buildings. Who can better guide this movement and make it fruitful in

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1902,
p. 81.

good results for each district than the principal himself aided by his teachers?"¹

The next year, Superintendent Seaver related that three educational centers had been organized during the previous year under the direction of two principals, one of whom was Dutton, and a submaster. The reports of these principals showed that classes in domestic arts, industrial handwork, singing and gymnastics were popular and successful offerings for adults and youth beyond school age. Principal Dutton, in addition, had a Shakespeare class composed of girls, and classes in beginning French, civil government, and bookkeeping. Men and women attended lectures, concerts, dancing, and games of a social nature. The older boys and girls of the day schools were invited to come to the centers to study "home lessons," and after an hour of study, were permitted to spend another hour at "dominoes, checkers, and other quiet games."

Such experiments, in the opinion of the Superintendent, showed that the social life of a neighborhood could be reached by the school in ways previously not tried by school authorities, and that here was a fallow field which should be cultivated by every principal in the city. The social center should be regarded by principals as much more significant than a passing fad; its purpose was much greater than merely to make more extended use of the buildings. Its purpose, Seaver argued, was both social, refining and elevating the life of the neighborhood, and educational, improving the sense of educational values of adults, and increasing the respect of boys and girls, through the examples of parents' attendance at social centers, for their own school work.²

Principals took the initiative in establishing social centers in the public schools of Chicago. In 1907, Principal Azile Reynolds of the Kinzie school, formed an association of alumni which held, during the year, a number of neighborhood gatherings to which parents were invited. These social gatherings attracted the attention of Mrs. William F. Dummer, a philanthropist, who gave Miss Reynolds assistance in experimenting with types of recreation and entertainment in the school building for the benefit of the young people of the community.³ An additional center was organized by another woman principal shortly afterward.

¹Ibid., pp. 82-83.

²Twenty-third Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1903, pp. 151-54.

³Fifty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1912, p. 207.

In 1910 the work of the two principals was cited by the Superintendent. They held community meetings twice each week, and served without remuneration. Their work, according to the Superintendent, refuted the belief held in some cities, that principals and teachers were too formal and didactic in manner to conduct recreation centers successfully, and resulted in the establishment by the Board of Education of several social centers for the ensuing year.¹ These official centers were opened upon application of the principals of schools and approval by the Superintendent. They were directed by day-school principals, assisted by regular teachers, and were organized in accordance with the traditions and customs of the life of the community in which the school was situated.² The principals were credited by Assistant Superintendent Shoop with appropriate social spirit and the ability to turn to account, as a school room asset, the new perspective of youthful life afforded by the recreational centers.³ Their ability as community leaders was attested by their success in gaining the co-operation, and frequently the financial assistance, of local women's clubs, the Juvenile Protective Association, the Chicago Woman's Aid, the Y.M.C.A., parent-teacher associations, and improvement clubs.⁴

During the school year 1910-1911 principals in nine Chicago centers recorded 297 meetings, with a total attendance of 70,870 people, and an average attendance of 239 people. The following year principals in sixteen centers held 382 sessions, with total attendance of 58,875 men and 36,342 women, the average attendance being 249.2 people.⁵

The published reports of the principals showed that reasonable latitude in choice of activities increased interest in the recreational and educational aspects of the programs; that young people learned through participation, to adjust themselves better to the requirements of their communities; that a keen sense of fair play was often developed; that social graces and civic habits were ingrained in young people having few other worth-while social contacts; and that large numbers of people of different nationalities mingled in the pursuit of common interests, breaking down barriers of national, racial, and religious prejudices, and

¹Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1910, pp. 96-97.

²Fifty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 193-94.

³Ibid., p. 194.

⁴Ibid., p. 206.

⁵Ibid., pp. 198-99.

gaining new concepts of American citizenship.¹

Early efforts of principals to interpret the work of the schools to parents.- In 1904, principals in New York held meetings of parents in the schools for the purpose of explaining special phases of the work, such as manual training, geography, and the like. Talks on each topic, frequently illustrated by lantern slides, were given by principals. Parents showed great interest in the programs, and attended in large numbers.² In the following years, the programs were extended by the principals to include class demonstrations and exhibits. Special visiting days were arranged in many schools. The programs were held either in the afternoon or evening. Declamation contests were sometimes utilized as a climax for programs, and prizes were frequently furnished by members of the school board.³ In 1910, principals in Detroit having schools with electrically lighted auditoriums and stereopticons extended the scope of entertainment programs given for parents in previous years, to acquaint parents with the work of the classroom. Demonstrations by the pupils of the upper grades, dramatizations by pupils of the primary grades, and lantern slides were used to illustrate methods and subject matter. Ninety-two programs were held during the school year 1910-1911, and a total attendance of 20,172 was recorded, of which 4403 were men, 10,130 were women, and 5639 were children.⁴

Various other methods were utilized by principals in the years around 1912 to acquaint parents with the work of the schools. Parents came to schools in groups in 1913 to see self-governing classes at work, to listen to explanations of school work given by speakers in mother-country languages, to attend mothers' study hours arranged by principals, to observe monthly visiting hours arranged for their convenience, and to see Child Welfare exhibits procured for schools by principals.⁵

Parent-teacher associations.- In addition to mothers' clubs, previously discussed, principals encouraged the formation

¹Ibid., pp. 200-204.

²Sixth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1904, pp. 108-09.

³Eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1906, pp. 149-50.

⁴Sixty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Detroit, 1911, pp. 169-70.

⁵Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1913, pp. 363-405.

of parents' associations of various types. In 1913, forty parent associations were reported in the grammar school districts of Boston.¹ Principals in New York during the years 1912-1914 were adding to the number of new associations, and devising more comprehensive programs for those already established. One district superintendent reported a successful parents' association in each of the twenty-four schools of the district. Attendance at some of the meetings reached 800.² Physicians were invited to discuss factors in preserving the health of children, and assistant superintendents were asked to discuss school problems.³ The associations, on the other hand, rendered such services to the schools as furnishing seed for school gardens, giving entertainments to raise funds for pupil lunches,⁴ assisting in decorating the schools, furnishing indigent children with food, clothing, and eye-glasses,⁵ requesting the school board to install auditoriums, enlarge gymnasiums, and install kitchens in the local school, procuring picture machines and victrolas, beautifying exteriors of school plants, and furnishing medical services to needy pupils.⁶ They also co-operated in the school projects of principals, such as correcting the errors in spoken English of the pupils.⁷ In St. Louis, in 1917, the President of the School Board praised the aid rendered by the School Patrons' Association, the central organization of sixty school recreational centers, pointing out that the constitution of the organization expressly provided for "financial aid whenever practicable to enable the principals to equip and provide the respective schools"⁸ with libraries, apparatus, and other essentials for which the Board had made no provision, and which tended to improve methods of instruction in the various

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1913, pp. 195-203.

²Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1914, p. 502.

³Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 368-82.

⁴Ibid., pp. 415-17.

⁵Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 487.

⁶Ibid., p. 503.

⁷Ibid., pp. 503-505.

⁸Sixty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1917, p. 25.

grades.¹

Community activities of principals for the promotion of health.- During the period 1900-1917, principals devoted considerable attention to activities connected with the preservation of health in community as well as in school. In 1906, a principal who kept statistics on the prevalence of contagious diseases among school children, estimated that the availability of baths in his school eliminated seventy-five per cent of the contagious diseases among school children formerly prevalent among the pupils.² Principals were required by boards of education in most large cities to give special co-operation to officials and physicians of boards of health with respect to health inspections of pupils and use of the school as a place of vaccination.³ In 1907, lists of dispensaries were prepared for the use of principals,⁴ and in 1908, principals reported on the results of medical inspections of pupils sponsored by women's clubs and associated charities.⁵ Nurses were required in 1912 to report daily to principals, and to work in quarters which principals assigned to them.⁶ Dental clinics were established in schools by 1913, principals reporting more than 6000 treatments in a single school during the course of a year. Through co-operation with hospitals, principals also brought a large number of cases under operative and medical treatment.⁷ Eye clinics were established for testing children's eyes and fitting them with glasses through the influence of principals with specialists who were willing to donate free service on certain days of the week.⁸ Principals consulted with charity societies regarding open-window classes, gained consent of parents, and with the aid of the societies, established a large number of

¹Ibid., p. 25.

²Fifty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1906, p. 186.

³Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1906, p. 255.

⁴Fifty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1907, p. 186.

⁵Thirty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of Minneapolis, 1908, pp. 68-71.

⁶Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1912, p. 117.

⁷Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 363.

⁸Ibid., p. 366.

such classes in neighborhoods having serious health problems.¹ Oculists, dentists, and physicians of repute were often enlisted to give free treatment to pupils certified as indigent by principals.²

Provision for lunches, especially in socially decadent neighborhoods, was another measure undertaken by principals to improve the health of children of the community. The advantages to be enjoyed from co-operation with women's clubs, charity associations, and other civic and social agencies with respect both to assistance in preparing lunches and to financial support, were soon discovered and utilized. In Chicago, for example, where penny lunches were established in 1910, the assistance rendered principals³ in the operation of the lunches was reported as extremely valuable. The lunches were regarded by principals not only as a health measure, but also as an important factor in the reduction of truancy.⁴ Principals in New York in 1912 testified to the beneficial physical effects of hot lunches served by the School Lunch Committee, an organization formed by philanthropic women to supply wholesome lunches at cost for school children.⁵ A principal in New York in 1913 arranged for the distribution of milk and crackers to first-grade children at 10:30 in the morning and 2:30 in the afternoon, a practice highly praised by the district superintendent as maintaining the vigor and spirit of the young children throughout long sessions of classwork.⁶ Principals of the same city were commended the following year for organizing after-school classes in which teachers voluntarily gave instruction to foreign mothers in use of gas stoves and in preparing lunches for their children.⁷

Establishment of home gardens.- Home gardening was developed through local schools in Boston as early as 1906. Interest

¹Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 451.

²Ibid., p. 459.

³Fifty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 174-75.

⁴Fifty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1911, pp. 129-30.

⁵Fourteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1912, pp. 186-89.

⁶Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 402.

⁷Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 459-63.

in this community project continued to increase until, in 1913, a single school reported as many as 289 home gardens, in addition to a common garden section of two or three acres under the control of a social agency.¹ In 1913 New York principals were reported by district superintendents to be utilizing school gardening as a means of stimulating activity in home gardening, more than 500 pupils in one school cultivating home gardens.² Exhibitions of home-grown plants in the schools were sometimes held to stimulate home-garden projects.³

The principal's role in the development of thrift practices.- An early step in the promotion of thrift practices was the movement to effect saving by simplifying graduation exercises in grammar schools. Boston principals were instructed by the Superintendent in 1908 to utilize every means to reduce expenses to parents at graduation time. Principals in Boston were allowed to maintain a savings system in connection with their schools under an act passed in 1911.⁴ Principals of New York in 1913 encouraged pupils to place their savings in banks and postal savings, 189 pupils of one school depositing \$2,526.38 in a neighboring bank. School savings banks were also established by many principals. At times, employees of banks were invited to go to a school to receive the deposits of the pupils. Usually school savings banks were administered by teachers and principals, but in some schools, the entire administration of the banks was turned over to pupils, the deposits reaching a total of more than \$3800 for a single school.⁵

Efforts of principals to aid indigent pupils.- The early provisions made by boards of education for the purchase of books for indigent pupils were continued into the new century. In Chicago, a special fund was set up in 1903 from which principals might requisition books for indigent pupils without being subjected to the delays often attending other types of requisitions.⁶ In 1913, New York principals organized personal service clubs

¹Annual Report, 1913, op. cit., p. 165.

²Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 414-15.

³Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 453.

⁴Annual Report, 1912, op. cit., p. 80.

⁵Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 367-417.

⁶Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1903, op. cit., p.32.

among the older pupils for the purpose of visiting hospitals and getting in touch with relief societies for extension of aid to needy families. They also encouraged teachers to discover needy pupils, in order that aid could be rendered through the distribution of shoes and clothes.¹ Children were also asked to bring outgrown clothing, and large boxes of clothing were provided by men and women principals, for keeping needy children in school. Principals also prevailed on wealthy citizens to furnish glasses to needy children having defective vision, and to provide shoes to children lacking them.²

Contacts with community institutions for educational purposes.- The idea of correlating classroom instruction with practical knowledge gained from contacts of pupils with outside institutions was much used by principals from 1910 to 1917. In 1911, the Superintendent of Schools in St. Louis wrote as follows:

"Where principals arranged to have classes or individual pupils visit the shops, factories, offices or other places of employment, the pupils were kindly received and profited by touch with men and women and youths at work. This kind of study of the world and men working in it, offers a most promising opportunity for the enthusiasm and pedagogic skill of the principal and his assistants."³

Excursions of pupils were organized by principals of New York to visit parks, museums, art-league lectures, motion-picture houses showing films correlating with class activities, lectures at the museum of natural history, and historic places. Prior to the trips, the pupils were given talks on the ethics of behavior in public conveyances and places. Visits were organized for purposes of research in public libraries, and for study of plants in special gardens and in parks. A principal acted as manager of lectures in the Bronx Botanical Gardens. The lectures were given by the director of the gardens and his assistants, and were illustrated by colored slides. More than 3880 pupils from a single supervisory division participated in excursions to the gardens during the spring term of 1913. In one school 966 pupils took part in excursions to two parks, 221 of whom had never before been in a large park.⁴ Folk-dancing clubs, athletic clubs, and game clubs,

¹Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., pp. 364-389.

²Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., pp. 437-55.

³Fifty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 46.

⁴Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., pp. 367-405.

the members of which took rides and walks to parks and historical places, proved instrumental in keeping children off the streets.¹

Community improvement.- Principals utilized their schools and the prestige of their office in many ways to give aid to, and effect improvement in, their school communities. At times the aid went far beyond the immediate school community; for example, in 1906, principals in Boston collected money to aid sufferers in the San Francisco earthquake.² Principals in New York in 1908 organized their corps of teachers to do social work among the girls in certain foreign districts, effectively influencing the girls in practices of American home life.³ Street cleaning squads of pupils were organized for the purpose of protecting neighboring streets and buildings from defacement or damage.⁴ Juvenile civic clubs were formed in 1913 to clean streets, prevent fires, and promote helpful citizenship practices wherever possible. Trees were planted to beautify neighborhoods and arouse community spirit; traffic squads were organized and co-operation with civic committees for sane Fourth-of-July celebrations was effected.⁵ Principals secured the punishment of keepers of satellite stores for giving pupils obscene pictures, and selling them cigarettes.⁶ Through the co-operation of mothers' clubs, principals also induced small storekeepers to discontinue the use of petty gambling machines, and garage managers to exercise care in crossing walks at entrances to garages.⁷

Co-operation with community agencies.- Principals in Chicago gained the co-operation of police in providing for the safety and protection of their pupils in 1913.⁸ During the same

¹Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 459.

²Annual Report, 1906, op. cit., p. 54.

³Tenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1908, p. 181.

⁴Eleventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1909, p. 240.

⁵Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 362-409.

⁶Ibid., p. 405.

⁷Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 463.

⁸Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1913, p. 290.

year, principals in New York secured the co-operation of plant, fruit, and flower guilds to provide exhibits for the instruction of pupils, and of zoological gardens to provide dead birds for stuffing and mounting in the schools. Agreements were also made with public libraries to set up exhibits of pictures and to instruct classes in the use of reference books and the catalogue. Local libraries also agreed to provide facilities whereby foreign mothers could read stories in the mother-country language to their children. Land for school gardens was secured through a working agreement with the city's park commissioner. Civic associations co-operated with the schools in practical civic projects, and the co-operation of principals with phonograph companies resulted in aid in giving phonographic arithmetic tests. Principals also secured supplies of tooth paste free from prominent manufacturers to supplement instruction in the care of the mouth and teeth.¹ Concerts for parents' meetings were secured through the assistance of local musical organizations; motion picture shows for school children were made possible through the use of the auditoriums of local philanthropical organizations; the use of model flats was secured for instruction in domestic science; educational films were secured through co-operation with the directors of boys' clubs; and park commissioners were prevailed upon to furnish tools and plants for school garden projects. Principals obtained valuable assistance from neighborhood associations in securing convictions of keepers of disorderly apartment houses. These associations also provided police protection for parks in which children spent much of their play time.²

Community surveys by principals.- The value of community surveys by the principal was voiced by Associate Superintendent Edson of New York in 1911, as follows:

"The principal and class-teacher must necessarily take note of certain characteristics of the school as a whole before they can deal with individuals. Among the things to be noted are the nationalities represented, their traditions and peculiarities; the special conditions and general atmosphere -- favorable or unfavorable -- and questions of cleanliness and quiet; the occupations and amusements of the people in the vicinity; and the social organizations and relations existing in the school and neighborhood."³

¹Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., pp. 360-417.

²Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., pp. 436-56.

³Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of
Schools of the City of New York, 1911, p. 252.

Principal Joseph Griffin, of the New York Public Schools, made a remarkable survey of the conditions in his school community during the course of an investigation on the causes of truancy. His study included such factors as life along the river front, gang influences, effects of moving picture shows, opportunities for employment of boys, influence of the homes, and the effects of poor health of children.¹ Principals also made surveys of the native language situation in their school communities, in order better to plan instruction in English, and carried on studies of conditions in the community involving school-lunch needs, parent associations, and special civic activities.²

Varied types of community activity and relationships.-

Principals were engaged in a large number of miscellaneous duties and projects of concern to the school community, during the period 1900-1918. Some of these were prescribed, but many of them resulted from the initiative of the principals themselves or joint efforts on the part of principals and of school or community authorities. In 1901-02, principals in Boston co-operated with school authorities in giving public lectures on geographical topics.³ Chicago principals in 1903 were authorized to consider a pupil's absence because of a religious holiday valid and not to be counted against his record in the distribution of medals and honor diplomas.⁴ In 1905, differences of a serious nature between principals and parents were settled by the board of district superintendents.⁵ Boston principals in 1906 were authorized to use their own discretion regarding the elimination of afternoon sessions during stormy weather.⁶ The Quincy School Club of Co-operation was formed in 1908, consisting of pupils of the seventh and eighth grades and graduates of the school, to help graduates get positions. Co-operation of business men was secured and marked success was attained in securing positions. An effective follow-up

¹Fourteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., pp. 245-51.

²Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., pp. 446-65.

³Annual Report, 1903, op. cit., p. 149.

⁴Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1903, op. cit., p. 20.

⁵Fifty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of
Chicago, 1905, p. 150.

⁶Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1906,
p. 53.

system was developed to keep in touch with, and assist, all graduates.¹ Principals in New York were commended in 1910 by the Superintendent for using their influence to allay protests by indignant parents backed by local boards of trade, regarding transfers of pupils. The transfers were necessitated by economies, and entailed long trips by pupils, but the parents were finally prevailed upon to use patience until conditions could be improved.² In 1912, Boston principals were authorized to decline admission of pupils to kindergartens after fifty had been admitted. They were not allowed to assign home work to pupils below the sixth grade, and not more than one hour daily in grades above the sixth.³

Principals in Boston, as well as other employees of the Board of Education, were forbidden to make political speeches, get contributions for political objects or for clubs having political objects, take part in any political campaigns, or, during school hours, engage in any political discussions. They might influence legislation only through petition to the School Board. However, they were permitted, outside of school hours, to express political opinions, sign nominations, and vote without restrictions.⁴

School credit for activities carried out in the homes was introduced by principals as early as 1913. Teachers were sent to the homes to inspect school gardens, repairs of furniture and electrical equipment, varnishing and painting, wood chopping, garden boxes, play-houses, and the like. The co-operation of parents was secured, the parents filling out and signing blanks testifying that certain jobs had been done "willingly, well, and without waste." The plan, according to the report of one principal, did much to affiliate home and school, and was generally successful.⁵

Principals utilized notices printed in the mother-country language of certain local groups to inform parents of school policies in 1913.⁶ Principals and teachers in a single district of

¹Annual Report, 1913, op. cit., pp. 164-65.

²Twelfth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1910, p. 278.

³Annual Report, 1912, op. cit., pp. 106-107.

⁴Ibid., pp. 57-58.

⁵Annual Report, Boston, 1913, op. cit., pp. 163-64.
Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., pp. 349-50.

⁶Ibid., p. 402.

New York City in 1914 made more than 3200 visits to homes to establish good relations between home and school, and after-school classes were conducted for instructing foreign mothers in sewing, reading, and writing.¹

Principals of Cincinnati in 1916 established a "Civic and Vocational League" consisting largely of the civic clubs of the eighth grades. Its main purposes, according to the report of a principal, were to study the civic and vocational life of the city, to teach members to meet civic needs of the community, to assist civic institutions, to promote the civic life of the city, and to connect the work of the schools more closely to the life of the community. The organization received special support from the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce and the Woman's City Club. In the opinion of the Superintendent, no movement connected with the schools gave "greater promise of large results."² The President of the School Board of St. Louis in 1917 gave special commendation to the aid given by principals and their corps of teachers in a special bond election to secure additional funds for the schools.³

Community Leadership of Principals Since 1918

Activities of principals during the World War.- Official documents of the war period contained considerable data regarding the role of the schools in war work, but were not usually specific regarding the participation of principals. St. Louis was one of the few large cities in which the detailed activities of principals during the period were officially recorded. Thrift stamp buying was inaugurated by a meeting of St. Louis principals in which plans were made for a drive in all schools. The principals also took a leading part in the Liberty Loan drives. Each school was made a unit, and drives were conducted by principals in each school district. Finally, the principals conducted the Red Cross drive of the schools.⁴

Community drives.- Undoubtedly, one of the effects of the World War was to reveal how effectively the school could be used

¹Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., pp. 457-63.

²Eighty-seventh Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1916, pp. 67-69.

³Sixty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 18.

⁴Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1918, p. 53.

as a unit for drives by various civic, social, and financial interests. Many of the drives or campaigns for which institutions of various kinds later desired to utilize the public schools were of a worthy nature, but others were of questionable educational value and were conceived merely to further propaganda of a financial or political type. At any rate, principals were soon confronted with a serious problem in the form of continual interruptions to the regular work of the schools through requests, at times from local agencies, again from city or national agencies, which had gained the approval of school boards, to conduct drives in school or community, or both. Superintendent McAndrew of Chicago in 1924, in commenting on the fact that principals made progress during the year in organizing and reducing participation in activities requested of the schools by civic, cultural, and philanthropic organizations, listed the requests as follows:

"boys' week, girls' week, bird day, tag day, poppy day, bundle day, mothers' day, Uncle Robert, Christmas giving, Thanksgiving offerings, prize essays, Wilson Memorial, Oratorical contests, Louvain restoration, Red Cross, better homes movement, anti-cigarette campaigns, humane celebrations, Serbian relief, Marne monument, Salvation Army aid, Thomas Jefferson Foundation, milk fund, etc."¹

The principals effected improvements, according to McAndrew, by recognizing each worthy drive, but consolidating them through careful planning at the beginning of the year. He requested the Board to designate a limited number which might appropriately be pursued by the schools.² The following year the Board approved participation "to a reasonable extent" in drives for the following purposes:

- (1) Thanksgiving contribution to School Children's Aid Society
- (2) Red Cross, Annual Roll-call Day
- (3) Christmas cheer to hospitals, etc.
- (4) Washington's Birthday civic celebrations
- (5) Clean-up Week
- (6) Near East Relief -- Bundle Day
- (7) Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, or Camp Fire Girls
- (8) One other activity to be selected by the Board

during the year.

"Reasonable extent" was to be decided by the principal of the school, subject to reduction by the Superintendent, in any case,

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1924, pp. 5-8.

²Ibid., p. 8.

in accord with the demands of school work.¹ Committees of principals and teachers reported favorably on the policy of limiting the interruptions to school work due to drives, and the "use of the schools as collection agencies."²

In New York, principals throughout the city observed "Open School Week" in October and American Education Week during November, for several years prior to 1926. However, in view of the fact that the activities practiced during the two drives were similar, the Board of Education in 1926 recommended that both be observed during the same week.³ Open house for parents was held in all schools, and in 1926, 306,312 parents observed the week by visiting the schools.⁴ Principals were also held responsible for conducting "intelligent, active, and successful campaigns" on health days.⁵

Improved methods of publicity employed by principals.- Another feature of the principal's community work which was in a large part an outgrowth of war work, was the use of additional methods of publicity, among which were local and city publications, school newspapers, radio, and letters written to parents by children as exercises in English. The publication of a daily column in one of the leading city newspapers by members of the Chicago Principals' Club was an outstanding example. This column set forth every line of school service, such as academic subjects, citizenship, art, physical education, taxes, junior high schools, and the like. The Club also published booklets on the work of the public schools in the teaching of health and citizenship.⁶ The desire of principals to utilize school publicity for personal aggrandizement was refuted by the Superintendent; only a sincere desire to serve the children and the schools was evident.⁷ Principals were justified, according to Superintendent McAndrew, in

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1925, p. 68.

²Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1926, p. 21.

³Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1927, p. 123.

⁴Ibid., pp. 123-24.

⁵Thirtieth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1928, p. 306.

⁶Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1926, op. cit., p. 45.

⁷Ibid., pp. 72-73.

resenting the publication of unverified and unfair statements regarding the schools by newspapers, and the formation of a committee of principals to take up every case of unverified complaints published in the newspapers of the city was to be commended.¹

Principals in New York utilized both local and metropolitan press for advertising meetings of parents and giving publicity to the outcomes of such meetings.² In 1930, an experiment was reported by a district superintendent in which principals were organizing the district for the purpose of reaching all local newspapers. They sent out periodic releases, and assisted individual schools to distribute news items to the papers in their localities.³ School newspapers were also utilized for publicity regarding meetings of parents.⁴ A principal edited, under the auspices of the Board, an eight-page magazine called "Safety News."⁵

Radio broadcasting as a means of disseminating information regarding schools was utilized early by principals. Weekly talks were made by principals themselves and school activities, such as programs by school orchestras, choruses, harmonica bands, and dramatic clubs were broadcasted.⁶

Numerous other types of publicity appeared during this period. Posters made by pupils to be placed in the windows of business houses in the community,⁷ were widely utilized, especially in such movements as clean-up campaigns and safety drives. The practice of having children write letters to parents, requesting their presence at meetings, or reminding parents in foreign districts of the date and places for voting in city, state, and national elections, was widely used by principals.⁸ Leaflets

¹Ibid., p. 73.

²Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 116.

³Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1930, p. 399.

⁴Thirty-first Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1929, p. 315.

⁵Thirtieth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 183-84.

⁶Annual Report of the Superintendent, Chicago, 1925, op. cit., p. 52.

⁷Ibid., p. 21.

⁸Ibid., p. 20.

and bulletins were printed, and letters were mimeographed, for distribution to parents.¹

Measures for safety in streets and buildings.- In 1924, the School Boys' Safety Patrol, previously under the police department, was organized by principals of Chicago Schools. The principals selected boys above the fifth grade for patrol duty, provided for the selection of captains and lieutenants, and mapped out the dangerous crossings where pupils needed their aid. Lanes were laid out by which pupils would pass to and from school, belts and emblems were secured from the Superintendent, and the teachers of physical education were generally made faculty sponsors of the squads.² Co-operation with the police department was retained, the police providing officers to aid the principal in advising and training the patrol. In 1924, the number of school children killed in automobile accidents in Chicago was 185; in 1929, the number was 166. During the same years the fatalities to adults from automobile accidents were 389 in 1924, and 637 in 1929. The school authorities were of the opinion that the falling off in fatalities to children, in comparison to the increase in deaths of adults, was due chiefly to the work of the safety patrols maintained by the principals.³

Principals in New York, in 1927, were instructed to keep in touch with the police station and with patrolmen on duty with respect to safety of children in playgrounds newly opened. It was suggested that the principals develop such auxiliary support as the school and neighborhood might provide, utilizing the services of monitors with special insignia, of socially-minded people of the neighborhood, and of volunteers recommended by parents' associations. Principals were also expected to furnish the patrolmen of their districts with lists of suggestions designed to aid in the safeguarding of children, from time to time.⁴ Principals were requested to call meetings of parents, at which they were to provide three speakers selected from aldermen, assembly men, local clergy, police department or civic associations, to address parents on the subject of safety.

The matter of fire hazards in schools frequently became a matter of concern to city officials, especially to officers of

¹Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 351.

²Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1924, op. cit., p.41.

³School Facts. Chicago: Publication of the Superintendent of Schools, February 11, 1931, II, No. 2, p. 6.

⁴Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 119.

fire departments. In 1924, a committee appointed by the Mayor of Chicago, consisting of the Commissioner of Buildings, the Acting Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention, the Fire Commissioner, and other officials, reported to the President of the School Board that only 15 per cent of the one-hundred fire drills conducted by principals for their inspection were satisfactory. The Superintendent, consulting with principals and fire officials, drew up forty-three regulations covering fire drills, a model fire drill was given before all principals assembled, and a film depicting the details of a model drill was made and exhibited in the schools. During the following year, the drills reached a point of improvement where none were rated deficient by fire officials.¹ Principals were also required to meet the requirements of fire officials with respect to fire hazards about the school premises.²

Co-operation with parents.- The extensive use of tests for sorting and grouping pupils in the years immediately following the war necessitated a new type of co-operation between principals and parents. Parents often objected to having their pupils placed in certain groups following the administration of intelligence tests, or to having their children submit to tests of child-study departments to determine whether they should be placed in special divisions. It became necessary, therefore, for principals to interpret a new phase of school work to parents. This was usually accomplished through conferences.³ Special efforts were also made by principals to make parents feel welcome when visiting schools. One way of doing this was to place on walls welcome placards, such as, "We are here to serve you," and "The principal will appreciate your suggestions." A superintendent in 1926 reported that 291 of his principals extended their courtesy campaign to parents by placing 2024 attractive placards where they would meet the eyes of visitors.⁴ Pupils were trained in practices of courtesy, such as guiding visitors to the principal's office.⁵ Father-sons days, and mother-daughters clubs were formed and special meetings of

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1925, op. cit., p. 85.

²Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1926, op. cit.,
p. 12.

³Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1919, p. 85.

⁴Annual Report of the Superintendent, Chicago, 1926,
op. cit., p. 13.

⁵Annual Report of the Superintendent, Chicago, 1925,
op. cit., pp. 82-83.

these groups were held.¹ Principals utilized American Education Week especially for talks to parents on education and the community, and for utilization of "Know-Your-School-Day."²

The visiting teacher service was especially welcomed by principals as a means of improving contacts between school and home, and efforts were continually made to increase the amount of home visitation service rendered.³ May Festivals and community pageants designed to reach foreign groups⁴ of parents were also found helpful by principals.

New activities connected with health.- Principals were characterized as the most important factors in the financial, as well as the service, features of penny lunches, the statement being made that no amount of expert supervision could be effective unless the principals took direct, active, and continuous control of every feature of the lunch (Chicago, 1918). In 1924, principals were required to place the lunches in the hands of the head-attendants, exercising only general oversight. Form letters signed by the principal, the school physician, and the district superintendent were sent to all parents whose children had defects in vision, hearing, nutrition, breathing, or teeth, requesting that the children be taken to a physician, dentist, or oculist for correction of defects. The letters also contained a request for a notation from the home physician stating that the child was examined and was under treatment (New York, 1928). Nutrition experiments were carried on by principals in co-operation with tuberculosis associations (New York, 1926). Co-operation of parents was sought and obtained in seeking treatment, or removal, of physical defects of their children (New York, 1931).

Community improvement.- Emphasis on civic service to the community, as well as to the school, in the teaching of civic traits was a feature of the work of Chicago principals during the years 1924-1926. An example was the participation of schools in the annual clean-up campaign sponsored by the Association of Commerce. At first this movement was largely confined to high schools, but by 1925, approximately 200 elementary-school principals were co-operating, and the community achievements of the

¹Ibid., p. 84.

²Annual Report of Superintendent, Chicago, 1926, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

³Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 373.

⁴Thirtieth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, New York, op. cit., p. 378.

elementary school pupils were estimated at 275,000.¹ This included cleaning, painting, and planting activities, in addition to destroying vermin and removing rubbish from streets and alleys.² Principals also filled out a questionnaire prepared by the Association of Commerce on voluntary community activities performed by pupils. These included such activities as visits and gifts to disabled soldiers, magazines distributed to hospitals, donations to scholarship funds, and the like.³

A committee of Chicago principals in 1925 organized a project in community service which drew wide attention and commendation from citizens, local and metropolitan press, and also newspapers of other cities. This consisted of uniting school and community in an effort to substitute wholesome fun and engaging entertainment on Halloween night for mischievous activities and destruction of property. Parent and neighborhood associations provided parties; motion picture circuits and local theatre owners provided free picture shows. Local officials gave short, effective speeches to children on practical citizenship. These projects, supplemented by definite instruction in classes on community obligations and loyalty to one's community, had a remarkable effect throughout the community. After Halloween, great numbers of letters of commendation from business men were received by principals; police officers reported whole districts without any damage; and the Woman's City Club and the Chicago Association of Commerce passed resolutions commending the schools for their Halloween service. Special praise was given by the Mayor, who estimated the savings to public property as hundreds of thousands of dollars.⁴

The policy that community service by pupils was necessary to effective teaching of citizenship was set forth by Superintendent McAndrew in 1926, in the following words:

"It will be a great advantage to the community and to the schools if every principal will be able definitely to report that every pupil under his charge has done, during each term, at least one important act of community benefit. Many of the community services, such as Thanksgiving, Christmas offerings, in fact where most contributions of money are made, are not primarily civic acts by the children themselves; they merely act as transmitters of gifts made by their parents. What we

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1925, op.cit., p. 21.

²Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1924, op.cit., p. 7.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1925, op. cit.,
pp. 20-22.

⁴Ibid., pp. 6-7.

want are definite suggestions whereby it may become a regular thing for children, while receiving from the city, as does every child who attends school, to be giving something in return."¹

Continuing, McAndrew recommended a record book for each home room in which the voluntary community service of each pupil would be recorded, definite teaching that education is paid for by the community, discussions on community acts suitable for children of each age, and a system for giving credit and issuing diplomas in community service to pupils. A list of suggested activities was also submitted for approval by the principals.²

Co-operation with outside agencies.- Principals made considerable progress during the period following the World War in co-operating with extra-school agencies. They went beyond the stage of securing help from philanthropical agencies to aid school activities, and aimed at giving assistance to community activities of a public nature, at the same time securing instruction of a civic nature for the pupils. Co-operation with the Post Office in large cities was an illustration of the policy. Principals acting on the suggestion of the National Education Association, won the praise of postmasters by training children in the preparation of letters and parcels for mailing, and in passing on the training to parents in the homes.³

A modified version of the visiting committees of early school history was inaugurated in Chicago in 1925, when volunteer members of the Association of Commerce, on the invitation of the Superintendent of Schools visited a large number of the schools, and appraised the work of principals and their schools. The principal gave the visiting citizen an opportunity to see every kind of work which the visitor might select. The visiting citizens commented on such factors of the principal's work as fire drills, school patrols, co-operation of teachers with principals and participation in community enterprises.⁴

Another type of appraisal by citizens took place in 1926, when tryouts of pupil learning, termed "sampling days," were arranged by principals of Chicago. One-hundred and twenty elementary schools were selected by lot. One eighth grade pupil

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1926, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

²Ibid., pp. 5-6.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent, Chicago, 1925, op. cit., p. 23.

⁴Ibid., pp. 32-35.

was selected by lot from each of these schools, and was given a set of tasks proposed by a number of prominent citizens. The exercises involved knowledge of the common branches, use of tools, appreciation of music and art, care of person, use of the telephone book, sense of civic duty, and the like. The exercises were held in a public hall, and citizens were welcome to attend. In the opinion of principals and teachers, the project proved a good measuring stick for what the intelligent public thought that it wanted.¹

Principals co-operated with automobile clubs in the support of school patrols,² and with the Boy Scouts in promoting scout work in connection with the schools.³ A committee of principals in 1931 volunteered to prepare a bulletin listing the locations and activities of the chief welfare agencies in New York City, under such headings as Day nurseries, neglected children, temporary shelters, families, and girls and boys in difficulty. The bulletin was published by the Principals' Association and distributed to all the schools of the city.⁴ Other agencies with which principals were maintaining relations were dental foundations, institutes of child guidance, dairymen's leagues, and telephone companies.⁵ Few community agencies, commercial, public, or social, were overlooked in the attempt of principals to improve the environment of school children or to enrich their school activities.

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1926, op. cit.,
p. 27.

²Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
New York, op. cit., p. 118.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent, Chicago, 1926,
op. cit., p. 52.

⁴Thirty-third Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., p. 87.

⁵Ibid., p. 397.

CHAPTER VII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PERSONNEL OF THE PRINCIPALSHIP

Methods of selecting principals showed little refinement until after the advent of city superintendents. Prior to the middle of the eighteenth century, and for some years after, grammar-school principalships were held by men. Women, as noted in previous chapters, were limited to positions as principals of primary schools or girls' departments of grammar schools. Cincinnati, in 1836, had fourteen male principals and four female principals. Chicago, in 1854 had six principals, all of whom were men, but in 1870, board regulations permitted women to be principals of elementary schools having fewer than 600 pupils. In 1873, Chicago had twenty men and nineteen women in the elementary school principalships. Cleveland, unlike most other large cities, gave preference to women as building principals in elementary schools, the policy having gained headway as early as 1871. That year Superintendent Rickoff wrote as follows:

"I am gratified to report continued and even increasing success of the experiment of putting women at the head of all the Grammar and Primary Schools It cannot be denied that our schools are more efficiently governed and more thoroughly taught than when there was a man at the head of every house."¹

The agencies for the selection of the earliest principals were usually city officials, or school inspectors appointed by them. In Providence, in 1800, principals were elected in town meeting. In Chicago, school inspectors appointed by the common council selected the first principal in 1844. Principals were nominated in Cincinnati in 1857 by school trustees, and in New York in 1864 by ward trustees, though both cities had superintendents and certificating requirements. It was well toward the close of the century before the selection of principals was based on professional qualifications determined by superintendents.²

¹Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1873, pp. 87-90.

²Forty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1896, p. 33.

Yearly elections were the usual practice. New positions in the principalship were commonly advertised in newspapers. In Boston, as early as 1857, the newspaper notices specified how applications must be made for vacancies in the principalship, and how qualifications were to be submitted. The examining committee of the Board took all applications and written evidence from the Secretary's filed, and held personal interviews with the applicants. Further inquiries were made regarding qualifications. Provisions of statutes required that the candidates be examined, but were not specific regarding the branches in which masters were to be proficient. The examination was supposed to take into consideration the position in which the vacancy existed.¹

Qualifications of Principals Prior to 1875

Early methods of certificating principals.- Data concerning the academic qualifications of early principals are meager. It is known that some of them, notably in the eastern cities, were either ministers or men trained in the theological field.² In New York, in 1870, twenty-four, or more than one-half of the male principals, were educated in the public schools of the city.³ However, data are available which show that examinations designed to test the academic knowledge of candidates were introduced at an early stage by many city-school boards. Cincinnati, in 1838, had two grades of certificates, the "first principal's certificate" and the "second principal's certificate." The branches in which candidates for these certificates were examined were English grammar, reading, spelling, handwriting, geography, and arithmetic. Ten years later, the certificates were known as the "Male Principal's certificate" and the "Female Principal's certificate." Candidates for the male principal's certificate were examined in all of the common branches, and in addition, in natural history, elements of natural philosophy, algebra, constitution of United States, constitution of the state of Ohio, ancient and modern history, astronomy, geometry, trigonometry, mensuration, and surveying. Apparently the examinations were largely oral, for the regulation read that each candidate was to be examined separately, and one member of the Board conducted the examination in

¹Report of the Schools Committee of Boston, 1857, pp.269-70.

²Report of the School Committee of Providence, 1900, p. 20.

³Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1870, p. 199.

each subject. Failure in one subject by a candidate meant failure in the entire examination. A specimen of the handwriting of each candidate, and a statement of the "character" of his examination, were kept in a record book for the use of trustees and visitors.¹

Principals in New York City were required by 1854 to qualify for certificates issued by the Superintendent of Schools. Three types of certificates were granted to candidates for teaching positions, but only holders of certificates of "Grade A" were employed as principals. The certificates simply stated that the candidate had been duly examined and found qualified in respect to learning, ability, and moral character.² The selective character of the certificate was largely nullified, however, by a provision that entitled all teachers then employed, and all graduates of the State Normal School, and Free Academy, to receive certificates of Grade A.³

In 1859, standards for principals' certificates in Cincinnati were raised by the addition of the subjects, theory and practice of teaching, and chemistry, to those in which the candidate was previously examined. The following year, an average mark equal to, or in excess of, two-thirds of the possible total of marks was required. In 1864, the passing mark for the principal's certificate was set at seventy per cent.

The system of examining principals annually was an early practice in some cities. In San Francisco, during the years 1853 to 1863, the principal's certificate was valid for only one year, and renewals were not permitted. The certificate in addition to statements of the candidate's moral character, learning, and aptness for teaching, contained the provision that it would "continue in force for one year, unless sooner revoked by the Board of Education."⁴ Superintendent Swett published a set of the questions in geography to which, as a principal, he was subjected in 1860. The questions were prepared by a member of the examining committee who was a dentist:

1. Name all the rivers of the globe.
2. Name all the bays, gulfs, seas, lakes and other bodies of water on the globe.

¹Nineteenth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1848, pp: 72-73.

²Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1854, p. 25.

³Ibid., p. 25.

⁴Annual Report of the Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, 1892, p. 123.

3. Name all the cities in the world.

4. Name all the countries in the world.

5. Bound all the States in United States.¹

The time set for answering the questions was one hour. At the end of the hour, one candidate had quit, stating that if required to write a primary geography, he must be paid for it; one had reached the fifth question; and one had reached the fourth question. On hunting up the papers in the files years later, Swett found that all candidates had been marked exactly the same, sixty per cent.

Candidates for the principal's certificate in Chicago in 1868 were required to send their testimonials to the examining committee of the Board when an examination was announced. The Committee then invited only a selected number to take the examination. In an examination held to fill a vacancy in a certain school, seventeen of more than fifty applicants were invited to write. The subjects of the examination were "orthography and definitions," "arithmetic," "English language and literature," "geography and history," "miscellaneous questions," "natural science," and "algebra and geometry." None of the questions referred to teaching procedures. Eight of the seventeen candidates were granted certificates.²

Age and experience were factors in qualifying as a principal in Philadelphia in 1870. Three grades of certificates were based on results from a single examination. The questions were based on the materials of text books used in the schools. A first class certificate was issued on a rating of not less than seventy-five; a second-class certificate on a mark of not less than sixty-five; and a third-class certificate on not less than sixty. The first-class certificate qualified candidates for principalships of grammar schools, and the second-class certificate for principalships of consolidated schools, provided the candidate was twenty-one years of age. However, if the candidate was a graduate of the Central High School, he need be only eighteen years of age to be a principal of a consolidated school. Principals of grammar schools were required to have three years of teaching experience; of consolidated schools, two years of experience; and of primary schools, one year of experience.³

New York City, in 1871, advanced standards for the

¹Ibid., p. 124.

²Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1868, pp. 33-37.

³Annual Report of the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia, 1870, p. 217.

selection of principals by requiring candidates nominated by boards of local trustees to pass an examination before being recommended by the Board's committee on appointments. Prior to this, a principal was required only to hold a teacher's certificate of the highest class. The new examination was to be based on intellectual qualifications, teaching ability, general record, and physical fitness.¹

The foregoing facts show that by 1875, the policy of requiring certificates of higher standard than those issued for classroom teaching was quite generally adopted in large cities. This had the effect of lessening sponsorship of candidates by trustees on personal grounds, and of raising academic standards where written examinations were utilized. However, little emphasis was placed on professional subjects in examinations, and requirements of university or normal school training apparently had not yet been considered.

Personal qualities.- Very little heed was paid to the personal qualities of principals until superintendents began to give close attention to administrative and supervisory functions. In 1867, intellectual competency gained "through culture, training, and experience," ability to appreciate the responsibility of the office, ambition to render useful service, and a mind open to new knowledge were characterized as desirable qualities in a principal.² Superintendent Philbrick, in 1857, characterized the head masters of Boston grammar schools as being zealous, earnest, open-minded and imbued, in a majority of cases, with the spirit of progress.³ In 1868, he stated that principals, as shapers of destiny, should themselves be wisely shaped. They should be of "fine natural material," standing high in manners, learning, moral sentiment, practical ability, and intellectual capacity.⁴ Principals in New York, in 1871, were expected to possess "a clear head, an organizing mind, and a strong will."⁵

¹Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1871, p. 24.

²Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1867, pp. 7-8.

³Annual Report, 1857, op. cit., pp. 34-35.

⁴Annual Report of the Schools Committee of Boston, 1868, pp. 176-77.

⁵Thirtieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 206-207.

Development of the Qualifications of
Principals from 1875 to 1900

Changes in methods of appointment.- In 1876, President Wood of the Board of Education in New York City claimed that the Board, under the statutes then in force, had only indirect responsibility for the character and competence of principals. The appointments, he pointed out, were made in nearly all cases by the local trustees. These trustees were appointed by the Board of Education and were its agents for minor appointments. They were liable to removal in case of misuse of power. In any event, Wood argued, a system of rigid examinations in the superintendent's office precluded the possibility of incompetent persons being foisted upon the system through use of political or social influence.¹ In Chicago, the practice of determining eligibility by examination was continued, but the provision that all principals must be residents of the city was added.² In 1895, the Board of Education nominally delegated to the Superintendent the power, subject to Board approval, to examine, select, assign, and transfer principals and other candidates for positions in the educational department. The policy was voiced by President Cameron in 1896 in the following words:

"Especially should the educational department be left free from non-professional interference and restriction, and the legal powers of the appointment and removal of teachers in the largest measure consonant with the right of review by the Board, be cheerfully committed to the Superintendent and his assistants."³

In St. Louis, married women were not eligible for appointments as principals or teachers. The marriage of a woman was considered as a resignation from the service.⁴

In Boston, from 1876 to 1897, appointments of principals were made by sub-committees of the School Committee to a committee on nominations. The nominating committee transmitted all their nominations to the Board for approval or rejection. In 1897, a change was made by which all recommendations for nominations were

¹Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1876, p. 23.

²Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1881, p. 21.

³Forty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 33.

⁴Forty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1899, p. 290.

made by the Board of Supervisors to the Board of Education. In 1898, however, new rules were adopted, placing the appointing power, subject only to the approval of the Board, in the hands of the Superintendent.¹

The charter for New York City in 1897 provided that all eligible lists of teachers be prepared by a board of examiners of which the Superintendent was president. Nominations were supposed to be made only from these lists by borough superintendents. Brooklyn was an exception, nominations there being made by a committee of local trustees. However, much evidence was discovered by the Superintendent which showed that unprofessional methods were frequently employed by Brooklyn principals to secure appointments and promotions.² In Manhattan and the Bronx, nominations were supposed to be made in the order of highest standing on the lists, and in other boroughs, from any position on the lists.³

Improvement in certification of principals.- The greatest advance in the certification of principals in the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century was the requirement of professional study in addition to the subject-matter knowledge previously demanded. The first method of determining the professional knowledge of candidates for principals' certificates was the addition of the theory of teaching to the subjects of examination. In St. Louis, in 1885, candidates were required to pass written examinations in geometry, algebra, natural science, English literature, general history, Latin, "history and grammar of the English language," and "theory and history of education." An oral examination in the common branches was also administered. Inspection of the questions used in the subjects other than theory and history of education shows no question referring to methods of teaching. This condition possibly resulted from the fact that the principal's examination was also administered to candidates for position of assistant in high school. The five questions in the theory and history of education called for (1) the titles of books on the "science of education" recently read by the candidate, (2) the names of the authors of such works as Leonard and Gertrude, Emile, Some Thoughts Concerning Education, and School Economy, (3) the meaning of "compulsory education" and where it was practiced, (4) the aims of instruction in drawing, and an outline of a course in drawing suitable for a city school, and (5) a method for

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1898,
pp. 13-14.

²First Annual Report of the City Superintendent of
Schools of the City of New York, 1899, p. 87.

³Ibid., p. 85.

beginning the teaching of fractions, with a plan for the first lesson.¹

Samples of the principal's examination in St. Louis in 1887 and 1894 show no appreciable change in subject matter. The questions in theory of education in 1887 included methods of teaching the common branches, such as ways of questioning pupils on passages from McGuffey's Reader, and plans for utilizing memory in elementary number work.² In 1894, the entire paper on theory was given to an "essay" on "Natural Science Teaching in the Primary Schools."³

In 1894, the Board of Examiners in Cincinnati examined candidates for the principalship in twenty-one subjects. Comparison of the list of subjects with lists previously required in Cincinnati showed development in two aspects. Provision was made for professional study by the inclusion of theory and practice of teaching, and for the special subjects by the inclusion of drawing and vocal music. Each subject was rated on a basis of ten points. In order to pass, the applicant had to receive an average of seven points, with the standing in no subject less than seven. Certificates were issued for two, three, and five years, the latter being the longest period permitted by law.⁴ Principals might have five-year certificates renewed by examination in all subjects in which prior standings were less than nine.⁵

In 1897, teachers who had served with distinction in the city schools, or applicants from other cities, were admitted to principals' examinations in St. Louis, provided, in either case, that they held diplomas from first class normal schools or colleges.⁶ The principals' examinations were for the sole purpose of having a number of names on the eligible list from which principals might be appointed as vacancies occurred. No certificates

¹Thirty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1885, pp. 42-47.

²Thirty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1887, p. 57.

³Fortieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1894, p. 51.

⁴Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1894, pp. 210-11.

⁵Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1896, p. 226.

⁶Forty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1897, p. 22.

were issued, and no promises were made regarding the employment of successful competitors in the examination. A list of books on which the examinations were based was published. The books on which the professional examination was based in 1899 were R. H. Quick's Essays on Educational Reformers and J. G. Fitch's Lectures on Teaching.¹

Candidates for the supervising principal's certificate in Philadelphia in 1891 were examined in mental and moral science in relation to education, theory and practice of teaching, history of education, and school hygiene. In 1892, mental and moral science were replaced by educational psychology, science and art of teaching, history of education, school economy, and philosophy of education.² Philadelphia also had another type of certificate known as the principal's certificate. In 1891, the candidates for this certificate were required to pass examinations in the common branches, in certain high-school subjects, and in theory and practice of teaching. In 1892, elements of psychology was made an additional professional requirement. In 1897, a high-school diploma, or examination in all high-school subjects was made a prerequisite for entrance to the principal's examination, and candidates were examined in elements of psychology, history of education, school management, and theory and practice of teaching. Superintendent Brooks pointed out that these standards placed the principal's certificate on about the same plane as a diploma from the best normal school in the state, and protected the city from admission to the principalship of men and women of indifferent culture and scholarship.³

A great increase in professional standards of principal's certificates was effected in New York by the Board of Examiners. This board, which was established in 1897, prepared and administered such examinations as the Superintendent prescribed, issued certificates to those who passed, and prepared the eligibility lists. The minimum requirements for certificates were fixed by the Board of Education and were uniform throughout the city, though certain boroughs had additional requirements. The principal's certificate for elementary schools entitled the holder to act as a principal of any elementary school in the city, and in some boroughs, of a school containing both elementary and high-school grades. There were also two other types of certificates for principals: the head of department license which qualified

¹Forty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 288-89.

²Annual Report of the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia, 1897, pp. 72-78.

³Ibid., pp. 78-79.

the holder as a principal of a school having nine, or fewer, classes, and the high-school principal's certificate. All certificates were issued for a period of one year, and might be renewed without examination in case the work of the holder was satisfactory to the borough superintendent for two successive years. At the close of the third year of continuous successful service, the City Superintendent was authorized to make the certificate permanent. Certificates became void at the end of five years, however, in the event that the holder ceased to serve regularly in the city schools during that period.¹

To be eligible for the elementary-school principals' certificate, the applicant, in addition to passing the examination, was required to have one of the following qualifications:

a) Graduation from a recognized college or university, and two years of professional study in a university department of education or normal school, together with at least three years of successful experience in teaching or supervision subsequent to graduation.

b) Graduation from a college or university, together with at least five years' successful experience in teaching or supervision subsequent to graduation.

c) A New York State certificate granted subsequent to 1875, together with eight years experience in teaching or supervision immediately preceding the principal's examination (not valid in Manhattan, the Bronx, or Brooklyn).

d) Ten years' experience or supervision in city public schools immediately preceding the examination. (In Manhattan and the Bronx, a course of two years in pedagogy, or two sessions of not less than six weeks in a university or normal summer school, was also required.)

The foregoing requirements indicate marked progress over the standards for principals' certificates previously discussed, and are similar, in many respects, to requirements of the present day. The emphasis on professional study, especially, shows a very modern trend. The college degree, while not mandatory in every case, was nevertheless shown to be an almost necessary prerequisite for a prospective elementary-school principal. The provisions for applicants who were not college graduates were not valid in some of the boroughs, and were in all probability inserted in order to make older workers in the system feel that the doors of advancement were not entirely closed to them.

The position of each applicant on the eligibility list

¹First Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., pp. 159-61.

was determined by his marks in the written and oral examinations under the following heads:

- (a) Personality, studies, experience in teaching.
- (b) History and principles of education.
- (c) Methods of teaching.
- (d) School management.

The passing mark in each of the foregoing subjects was seventy per cent.

A scholarship examination was also required in English literature and rhetoric, and in two of the following fields: mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, psychology and logic, and modern and classical languages. However, applicants might be excused from the entire scholarship examination if they were college graduates, or, if not college graduates, from examination in those fields in which they could present evidence of a year or more of successful university work.

In the examination for the elementary principal's certificate in 1898, the applicant was required to answer eight of twelve questions in the history, and principles of education. The time for writing on this topic was three hours. The questions covered such topics as the aims of education, imitativeness during pre-school age, formation of habits, uses of induction and deduction in teaching, susceptibility, apperception and its relation to lesson plans, the views of Spencer as to "what knowledge is of most worth" and influences of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Spencer, and Plato. The examination in methods of teaching also was three hours in length. The questions were based largely on materials and methods in the common branches. One question required discussion of a statement by Dewey concerning the social element in a reading situation. The examination in school management dealt chiefly with practical aspects of the principal's work, such as practices with respect to home work, rating of teachers, helping young teachers, methods of punishment, school programs, heating and ventilation, promotions, and correction of common faults in classroom teaching.²

The questions were of the essay type and general in nature. Although the suggestion was made at the beginning of the examination to refer to authorities where appropriate, the applicant had to draw chiefly on his experience for the answers. None of the questions dealt with measurement of pupil progress, individualization of instruction, or methods of diagnosing learning difficulties. In one instance, the actions of a problem pupil were

¹Ibid., pp. 168-70.

²Ibid., pp. 198-201.

described, and the causes of, and remedy for, his actions were requested. The question revealed the current faith in simple remedies for serious discipline problems, as compared with the complex and refined technique of case work today. One of the encouraging features of the examinations was the reference, from time to time, to current professional literature.

Candidates for high-school principals' certificates were required to be graduates of recognized colleges or universities, and to have not less than ten years' experience in teaching, at least five of which were in secondary schools or institutions of higher rank. They also were required to pass an examination including (1) personality, (2) record, (3) studies, and (4) history and science of education as applied to the administration and organization of secondary schools.¹

In discussing a court case in which a principal of an elementary school brought suit to force the placing of his name on the eligible list of high-school principals, Superintendent Maxwell clearly expressed his point of view regarding certain prerequisites for successful administration of high schools. He wrote in part as follows:

"It is certainly not an unreasonable requirement that a man who is to be principal of a great city high school should be a college graduate and should have had some experience in schools of the kind he is called to administer. Experience in managing an elementary school cannot of itself be regarded as qualifying a man for the principalship of a high school."²

In the case under discussion, the principal, prior to the consolidation of Brooklyn with New York City, held a certificate known as "Principal's A" in Brooklyn which provided "The holder of this certificate may be appointed the principal of a school." The principal was appointed to an elementary school, no provision then existing regarding certificates for high-school principalships. After consolidation, he sought a writ of mandamus to have his name placed on the high-school list. The decision was important in that it established that the holding of a principal's certificate gave a candidate no vested right to an appointment. The decision read in part as follows:

"Further, we are at a loss to conceive any vested rights in the relator which have been violated by the new qualifications prescribed by the Board of Education. By the issue of a certificate to him he became eligible to appointment as principal of a school, no distinction being shown between high-schools and other schools. He was appointed principal of a

¹Ibid., p. 184.

²Ibid., p. 99.

school, and continues in such place. It certainly was within the power of the Board of Education upon establishing schools of a higher character than those previously maintained, to prescribe new qualifications for teachers in those schools. The most the relator obtained under his certificate was eligibility to appointment if the Board saw fit to appoint him. He obtained no right to an appointment. He, therefore, had no vested right under his certificate."¹

New demands in personal attributes of principals.- The last quarter of the century witnessed an increasing interest on the part of superintendents in the personal characteristics and qualifications of principals. The fact that a majority of the principals of New York City were developed in the local system, and were well grounded in the special requirements of the local system was regarded by school officials in 1878 as a special advantage.² Superintendent McAllister of Philadelphia, in 1883 regarded high standard in principals' certificates as a means of securing scholarly and cultured teachers for supervisory and administrative leaders. The position of principal, in his opinion, required qualifications not found in every teacher, and successful classroom experience alone afforded no guarantee of success as a principal.³ Superintendent Tarbell of Providence in 1887 regarded skill, devotion, courtesy in relation to teachers and their work, and loyalty to superiors, as personal attributes worthy of cultivation by principals.⁴

The appointment of principals in St. Louis, according to Superintendent Soldan, was based on the supposition of superior scholarly attainments, pedagogical skill, and executive ability. Official authority required the support of strong personal qualifications. Strong manhood or womanhood, moral courage, and readiness to incur responsibility were indispensable. The principal, in dealing with children, needed to be wise, kind, and firm.⁵

With a man of weak character as a principal, Superintendent

¹Ibid., p. 101.

²Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1878, p. 40.

³Annual Report of the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia, 1883, pp. 68-69.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee of Providence, 1887, p. 16.

⁵Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1898, pp. 85-86.

Maxwell of New York stated in 1899, discipline and instruction throughout the school would suffer. Violent temper, and coarse and vulgar manners on the part of the principal would be reflected in classroom. On the other hand, if he were a lover of children, a student of child psychology, and were gentle and firm, wise and tactful, these qualities would create a wholesome atmosphere in school and influence the habits and ideals of the children.¹

Experience and qualifications prior to appointment.- Data regarding the qualifications of principals at the time of appointment are very meager. Practically the only records available in the reports of superintendents are the accounts of the lives of superintendents and principals' promotions, retirements, or deaths. For example, Superintendent Brooks, in discussing the appointments of assistant superintendents in 1899, stated that one of the appointees, prior to his appointment as principal of a school in Philadelphia, was a graduate of the First State Normal School of Pennsylvania, subsequently receiving the degree of master of science. Another was a graduate of a state normal school, was a principal of schools in a town of Pennsylvania for two years and superintendent of schools in a city in Delaware, prior to appointment as a principal in Philadelphia. Both of these appointees acquired the doctor's degree in pedagogy at the University of Pennsylvania after becoming principals in Philadelphia.² Thus it is known that leading principals appointed in large cities prior to 1900 sometimes had considerable administrative experience, possessed higher professional degrees, and had abiding scholarly interests.

Development in Personnel from 1900 to 1918

Methods of selection of principals.- It has already been noted that nominations of principals in many large cities were removed from the control of special committees and placed in the hands of superintendents. The movement was especially noticeable during the period 1895-1899. The movement was extended in the opening years of the new century for the purpose of freeing superintendents from any string connected with former practices, and from undue pressure from individual board members or politicians. In Chicago, the Board passed resolutions in 1900 stating specifically that the Superintendent need not request the concurrence of district committees in the appointment, transfer, or promotion

¹First Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit.,
p. 55.

²Annual Report of the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia, 1899, pp. 109-11.

of principals, and restated the policy that no principal could be appointed without the written recommendation of the Superintendent. A provision designed further to safeguard appointments was that whenever the Superintendent recommended a candidate, he was to file with the committee on appointments all written communications received by him from general supervisors, and also the names of all persons who had interested themselves in the appointment, either orally or otherwise.¹ The resolutions further provided that no member of the Board should recommend the appointment, promotion, or transfer of a principal to the Superintendent, unless requested in writing by the Superintendent to do so.²

The maintenance of suitable eligibility lists from which appointments might be made, and the order in which appointments should be made from these lists, continued to be a problem. In New York, in 1911, the advisability was discussed of limiting the number of names placed on the eligibility lists to provide only for vacancies likely to occur over a period of two years. The aim of this proposal was to raise the standard of those appointed.³ The following year, the new salary law making the salary of women principals the same as that of the men, and giving the maximum salary only to principals having a minimum of eighteen classes, brought certain complications in the nomination of principals. Previously a minimum of twelve classes had been required in order to qualify for the maximum salary. Principals of schools having from twelve to seventeen classes were now replaced by assistants to principals, and were advanced to schools of eighteen or more classes as fast as vacancies occurred. Also, principals of small schools in certain boroughs before consolidation with the city, were given places on the eligible list. The surplus of principals thus caused resulted in only one woman principal's being appointed in a period of two years. It was still the practice in New York at that time to assign only men to schools having boys through the eighth grade, and in large sixth grade schools having boys. Since mixed schools were fast gaining favor, the policy gave men a decided advantage in new appointments.⁴

In Philadelphia, eligibility lists were maintained for

¹Proceedings of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1900,
pp. 247-48.

²Ibid., p. 248.

³Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent
of the City of New York, 1911, p. 230.

⁴Fourteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of
Schools of the City of New York, 1912, p. 214.

candidates to the principalship. Appointment could be made only from the three highest on the list.¹ Problems concerning the removal of principals, and re-appointments of principals who previously left the service, were frequently encountered. In 1901, the Superintendent of Chicago Schools was authorized to give notice to principals whose services were unsatisfactory, that if, after four months trial sufficient improvement were not noted, they should be dropped from the rolls. The Superintendent was required to give reasons for dismissal, but his action was final unless reversed by the Board within one month after the report was received.² In New York, courts established the principle that a principal whose certificate had been discontinued after three years of service could not be re-appointed. A principal whose certificate was thus discontinued was reassigned to a school by the Board of Superintendents, but a candidate whose name was on the eligible list successfully enjoined the action.³

New requirements for principals' certificates.- Two examinations for principals' certificates were given in New York during the year of 1900. The questions in history and principles of education emphasized philosophy of education, psychology, history of American education, and such practices as correlation, manual arts, and self-activity. In methods of teaching, Herbart's formal steps, methods of memorizing passages, faults of the Grube method, vertical handwriting, concert recitation, and formal grammar, were among the topics treated. "School management" contained questions on methods of ascertaining group and individual progress of pupils, fundamentals of good supervision, elimination of burdensome routine in administration, practical measures for securing personal cleanliness, care of property, and courtesy, physical conditions and equipment of school rooms, economical methods of distributing classroom supplies, methods of judging a teacher's work during a given term, and means of enlisting pupil co-operation in a school. Grading of pupils, and discipline were mentioned once in each examination.⁴

¹Annual Report of the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia, 1913, p. 279.

²Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1902, p. 2.

³Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 279-85.

⁴Second Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1901, pp. 140-44. Also Third Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1900, pp. 153-56.

On the whole, the questions indicated that principals were expected to be abreast of current educational literature and practice. More attention to use of educational theory as applied to classroom practice, and less emphasis on administrative routine may be noted when the questions are compared with corresponding questions of the previous year.

In 1910, the oral and practical phases of the principal's examination in New York City included an investigation into the applicant's experience in teaching and administrative work. The data were secured from official records on file in the offices of the Board of Education and from special reports of district superintendents and principals. The candidates were also observed and rated in classroom teaching by members of the Board of Examiners, and in their ability to observe and criticize teachers giving classroom instruction. Oral interviews were held with candidates to determine their ability to discuss practical school-room problems. Finally, candidates were rated on personality on the bases of impressions received by examiners in the various other parts of the oral and practical tests.¹

It is worthy of note that when the question of limiting the number of applicants for certificates arose, as it did in New York about 1909 and 1910, the means recommended for raising standards centered on executive experience rather than on additional professional training. The large numbers of women applicants created the problem. It was recommended by members of the Board of Examiners that separate requirements in executive experience, such as head of a department for three years, be set up for women,² in view of the fact that less than one-third of the 254 women applicants were qualified to pass the examination.³ In 1911, Superintendent Maxwell requested that the plan to limit the number of candidates on a given eligibility list to the number likely to be appointed every two years, be given consideration. He pointed out that when a list lasted five or six years, many well prepared candidates were prevented from writing, and that current movements or changes in educational practice were not given due consideration.⁴

¹Twelfth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1910, p. 295.

²Eleventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1909, p. 281.

³Twelfth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 294.

⁴Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 170-71.

Complaint from candidates for the principalship regarding the unfairness of written examinations as a selective agency was a factor in the reduction of the passing grade on written examinations to 65 per cent instead of the 70 per cent previously required. This had the effect of making more candidates eligible for the oral and practice tests, and so making these tests a greater factor in the selection of principals. The opinions of the examiners on the merits of the change were various. One pointed out that the candidates were more dissatisfied than before, since the written examinations were more objective than the oral, giving less opportunity for charges of unfairness or prejudice.¹ Another believed that the new plan resulted in greater care in conducting oral and practice tests, and that the efforts exerted in this direction by the examiners merited public support.² A third examiner expressed the opinion that the long periods spent in preparing for examinations, through cramming, coaching, and similar methods, justified the criticism of the written examination as the main instrument of selection. He advocated, instead, a plan modeled after the practices of large industrial concerns in promoting employees. This involved advancement of employees through a competitive system based on the personnel records. The personnel cards showed such qualifications and traits as education, adaptation to work, special aptitudes, attitude toward duties, accuracy, need of supervision, teamwork, pronounced faults, pronounced good habits, and the like. He presented a plan whereby the candidate would be judged on the basis of his record, the written examination to count only twenty points. Such items as possession of the master's or doctor's degree, publications, and cultural travel were given considerable weight.³ One examiner disagreed with giving so much weight to the Ph. D. degree, fearing that it might encourage "industrious" though "inferior" people to aspire to the candidacy.⁴

A modification of the foregoing plan was later tried in case of candidates for two special positions, but was discarded because, in the opinion of the examiners, it failed to bring out shortcomings of the candidates which were not contained in the records.⁵

¹Sixteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1914, pp. 142-43.

²Ibid., pp. 212-13.

³Ibid., pp. 200-201.

⁴Seventeenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1915, pp. 192-95.

⁵Ibid., p. 211.

The outcome of the examination for principals given in New York in September, 1913, illustrated how candidates were sifted through examination to obtain an eligible list. The original applicants numbered 478. Thirteen of these were eliminated because their records were not satisfactory, evidence, according to an examiner, that the eliminative power of the records list was slight. In his estimation, if all candidates of approved service as attested by "AA records" were given certificates, there would not be more than one or two examinations for principals' certificates in a generation.¹

The next eliminating factor was the written examination in English. This examination was regarded as a test in culture of the type that any principal should possess. Only 267 of the original 478 braved this test, and 134 of them received the passing mark of 60. Thirty-one more were later passed on appeal. Of sixty-four receiving a mark of 70 or over in the English test, 36, or 56.3 per cent, finally received certificates; of the one hundred and one candidates receiving marks of 60 to 60, eleven, or 10.9 per cent, received certificates; while of the thirty-one who passed on appeal, not one received a certificate in the end. In the professional subjects, 50.3 per cent passed. Many cases were appealed; in the end, 48 candidates received certificates.² Examiners were of the opinion that every candidate receiving a certificate deserved one; that few strong men or women would be impelled by the ordeal of the examination to forego trying for a principalship; and that no candidate was rejected for any trivial deficiencies. An interesting finding was that high-school officials, while furnishing recommendations for individuals as requested by the examiners, were usually very vague when asked to point out good material for the principalship.³

The number of principals' certificates granted, in proportion to the number of applicants, in New York City over a period of years, is shown in Table IV. The totals show that only 177, or 30.8 per cent, of the candidates who applied for certificates passed. The figures indicate a high degree of selectivity on the part of the Board of Examiners. Undoubtedly the selections made were much more meritorious than if less scientific methods were used, or the appointments left to the subjective judgments of school officials.

Cultural and personal attainments.- In Chicago, in 1901, preference was given to candidates for the principalship having

¹Ibid., pp. 188-95.

²Ibid., pp. 188-92.

³Ibid., p. 190.

-171-
TABLE IV

NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS FOR ELEMENTARY CERTIFICATES GRANTED
AND NUMBER REFUSED IN NEW YORK CITY FROM 1901-1916

Year	Applications	Number Granted	Number Refused
1901	142	38	104
1904	104	27	77
1908	6	3	3
1911	66	53	13
1912	3	3	0
1913	1	1	0
1914	212	25	187
1915	36	23	13
1916	4	4	0
Total	574	177	397

collegiate or normal school training. In St. Louis, in 1904, normal school training was no longer regarded as sufficient for the principalship of grammar schools. All candidates were required to be graduates of colleges of national standing.

A number of observations regarding the type of person who should be in the principalship and the qualities he should display in the exercise of his duties was made by Superintendent Seaver of Boston in 1902. Among the attributes which he mentioned as advantageous for a principal to possess were (1) strength and wisdom to withstand untoward influences in the appointment of teachers to his school, (2) reasonableness in the use of authority, and (3) prudence in the administrative orders which he issued. Comparing the position of the principal to that of the captain of a ship, Seaver described the attitude which the principal should maintain toward the teachers, in the following passage:

"No wise principal will use overmuch the tone and manner of a commander. He will rather suggest what he would like to have done, or even assume the attitude of accepting the suggestions which have been drawn from the teachers themselves, by the exercise of his tact.

"The firm hand of authority should be well gloved in kindness and courtesy. Rudeness is everywhere reprehensible, but when shown by a superior towards an inferior in authority it is unpardonable. As in school, genuine, heartfelt courtesy exercised by teachers toward their pupils -- that watchful and delicate consideration of children's feelings which true

politeness requires in the schoolroom no less than in general society -- will do more for good discipline than all the scolding, compulsion and punishment ever inflicted; so with the principal and his assistant teachers -- the very fact that they are under the strong hand of his authority entitles them all the more to his courtesy and kind consideration. It is well to remember in conversation or argument that the superior in authority possesses a certain advantage which it would be unfair, or unwise, or in bad taste to make use of. Arrogance is the besetting sin of authority, and they who fall into it find trouble."¹

Proportion of men to women in the principalship.-- In 1901, the number of women principals in the elementary schools of Chicago was 115, and the number of men, 112. However, all of the 15 high school principals were men.² The superintendent stated that during the ten years prior to 1901, the number of women principals had always been slightly in excess of that of men. In Philadelphia, in 1909, there were 69 men and 104 women in the supervising principalships; in 1910, 74 men and 107 women; in 1911, 1912, and 1913, 76 men and 104 women.³ In Cleveland, also, women outnumbered men as principals of elementary schools.⁴ In St. Louis, during the period 1902-1916, the ratio of men principals of elementary schools to women principals was approximately two to one. In 1912, the number of men who were principals of Class A schools was 42, and the number of women was 11, but in Class G, the lowest class of schools according to size and salary, there were 11 women and no men. In the intervening brackets, the numbers of men and women were approximately even.⁵

In 1905, an assistant superintendent expressed the opinion that in certain aspects of discipline, women principals appeared to be more effective than men. He accounted for this through the great attention which women gave to details, their "singleness of

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1902, pp. 76-77.

²Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1901, p. 69.

³Annual Reports of the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia, 1909-1913, pp. 60, 53, 39, 44, 60.

⁴Fortieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1876, p. 39.

⁵Fifty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1912, pp. 219-24.

purpose," and their maternal sympathy for children in difficulty.¹ In 1907, Superintendent Maxwell stated that it was quite as difficult to obtain women principals of proper scholastic and professional attainments and executive ability as it was to obtain men principals. Consequently, he recommended making the salaries of women principals equal to those of the men. Women principals in New York were debarred by the by-laws of the Board of Education from appointment unless their husbands were incapacitated from earning a living, or had deserted their wives. However, women who married while in service were permitted to retain their positions.²

Data were not often published in the official records of school systems of large cities regarding the length of service of principals. The periods of service of supervising principals in Philadelphia in 1909 were as follows: 5-9 years, 7 principals; 10-19 years, 55 principals; 20-29 years, 45 principals; 30-39 years, 49 principals; 40-49 years, 11 principals; and 50 or more years, 4 principals.³ The average periods of service of principals in St. Louis in 1915 were as follows: men, 13.9 years; women, 32.1 years, and both men and women, 19.8 years.⁴ That the women principals were older in the service than the men may have been due to a situation common to large cities, namely, that women usually work their way up through the system, whereas men principals often enter the system from outside positions.

Professional attainments of principals appointed from 1900 to 1917.- Data from the accounts of deaths and retirements of 64 principals appointed from 1900 to 1917 show that 4, or 6.3 per cent, had the doctor's degree at the time of appointment; 5, or 7.8 per cent, had the master's degree; 14, or 21.9 per cent, had the bachelor's degree; 17, or 26.6 per cent, had diplomas from normal colleges, and in 23, or 35.9 per cent of the cases, no degree or diploma was mentioned. Appointment was recorded as late as 1915 of a graduate of a normal college⁵ and as late

¹Seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1905, pp. 171-72.

²Ibid., p. 66.

³Annual Report of the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia, 1909, p. 63.

⁴Sixty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1915, p. 288.

⁵Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1926, p. 113.

as 1916 of a person not having a degree or normal college diploma.¹ Six principals had taken graduate courses in education after receiving degrees, but prior to appointment. Three were recorded as receiving the master's degree subsequent to appointment; one, the doctor's degree in education; two, the doctor's degree in law; and three, as taking extensive graduate work in education.

Development of the Personnel of the Principalship Since 1918

Little change has occurred in the method of appointing principals since 1918. Practically all large cities have retained the policy of having eligibility lists, from which the superintendents have made nominations, usually following the order in which the names appeared on the lists. Examinations, or evaluation of records, and frequently both, have been used to determine the make-up of the eligibility lists. However, considerable change has occurred in the standards of scholastic and professional preparation required of candidates for the principalship.

Prerequisites for eligibility of candidates.- The eligibility requirements in New York City in 1923 did not differ greatly in outward form from those of 1899, but special emphases on professional courses, social and executive fitness, adaptability for certain types of communities, and the like, indicated development in accordance with modern professional trends. No age limit was placed on candidates within the system who wanted to take the principal's examination, but persons from outside had to be from 25 to 45 years of age in order to be admitted to examinations. Separate lists were maintained for men and women.²

In 1930, the Board of Examiners of New York City adopted a plan for giving special weight to supervisory experience, such as that gained by assistants to principals. This was regarded as equivalent to making the position of assistant to the principal a stepping stone to the principalship. A second innovation was the attainment of an average of 70 between the mark on the written examination and the mark on the candidate's record. This gave an opportunity to compensate for a low mark on one division of the examination by a high mark on the other.³ The changes were characterized by the chairman of the Board as not necessarily

¹Thirtieth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1928, p. 87.

²Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1923, pp. 90-91.

³Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1930, p. 425.

improvements in themselves, but experiments to show that the Board was willing to take any reasonable measures to bring about improvement.¹

The Board of Examiners in Chicago in 1930 devised a comprehensive rating device for candidates for the principalship. All candidates were required to present credentials showing that they were graduates of accredited colleges or universities and that they had at least six years of successful experience, two years of which were in actual classroom teaching. Next, a written examination was required, consisting of a major, namely, professional study; three full minors, English, mathematics, general history and civics; and four half-minors, i.e., general science, drawing, vocal music, and physical education. The major counted double the weight of a full minor. A general average of 80, with no subject below 50, was required. The rating sheet utilized to evaluate the oral and practice record of the candidate was as follows:

A. Preparation

1. Bachelor's degree	20
Total points	20
2. The following to be added to 1.	
a) Master's degree	5
b) Master's degree in education . .	5
c) Education courses -- 1 for each additional course in education .	6
d) Supervision and administration -- 2 for each major in supervision and school administration .	10
Total points possible	26

B. Experience

1. Elementary	12
1.5 for each grade	
2. Elementary supervision	6
a) In charge of branch -- 6	
b) Head assistant -- 5	
3. High school	6
(1 for each year) -- 6	
4. High school administration	10
a) Assistant to principal -- 10	
b) Head of branch -- 8 <u>or</u>	
c) Dean -- 6 <u>or</u>	
d) Head of department -- 3	
Total points possible	34

¹Ibid., p. 425.

C. Efficiency Rating

1. "Superior" for past two years . . . 20
2. "Excellent" for past two years . . 15
3. "Satisfactory" for past two years . 2
- Total points possible 20

D. Age Penalty

1. Age 54-60 -- $\frac{1}{2}$ point for each year
2. Age 61-70 -- 1 point for each year

E. Summary of Rating

1. Bachelor's degree 20
2. Other preparation 26
3. Experience 34
4. Efficiency 20
5. Less age penalty 1
- Total points possible 100

In St. Louis in 1926, there were 144 applications for principalships on file. Eleven of the candidates had 1 to 6 years of experience; 36 had 6 to 10 years; 30, 11 to 15 years; 31, 16 to 20 years; and 27 had 21 or more years of experience. One of the candidates was under 25 years of age; fifteen were from 25 to 29 years old; twenty-nine were 30 to 34; forty, 35 to 39; twenty-eight, 40 to 44; twenty, 45 to 49; and eleven, 50 or more years of age. The quality of testimonials of three applicants was negative; of four, weak; of eighty-six, moderate; of fifty-one, superior. The training beyond high school of three applicants was 2 years; of three, 3 years; of sixty-one, 4 years; of sixty-seven, 5 years; of eight, six years; and of two, 7 years. The types of specific training and the number of applicants having each type were as follows: irregular, 6; minor subject, 12; major subject, 20; graduate major, 106. The distribution of professional training in semester hours was: 0-9 hours, 6 applicants; 10-19 hours, 12; 20-29 hours, 20; 30-39 hours, 34; 40-49 hours, 32; 50-59 hours, 9; 60 or more hours, 31 applicants.² In comparison, the distribution of professional training for 109 principals currently employed was as follows: 0-9 hours, 21 principals; 10-19 hours, 16; 20-29 hours, 17; 30-39 hours, 20; 40-49 hours, 11; 50-59 hours, 16; 60 or more hours, 8 principals.³ Thus, 72, or 50 per cent of the applicants had forty or more

¹Circular of Information, Board of Examiners, Chicago Public Schools (July, 1930), pp. 7-8.

²Seventy-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1926, pp. 26-27.

³Ibid., p. 29.

semester hours of professional training, as compared with 35, or 32.1 per cent, of the regular principals, an indication of the increasing professionalization of the principalship. It also was evidence that only applicants having an appreciable degree of professional training need be employed as principals in the school systems of large cities.

In 1927, the rules of the Board of Education in St. Louis were cited as authorizing the Superintendent to judge the fitness of diplomas or certificates presented by applicants for elementary school principalships. The preliminary rating of applicants consisted of the total scores obtained in (1) specific training in a given field, (2) professional training represented by courses in education, (3) general training represented by all other college and university credits, (4) experience in teaching or administration, and (5) age.²

Five hundred and twenty applicants entered the examination for the principal's certificate in New York in December, 1927, but 220 were eliminated by the general information tests and the tests in English. It was estimated that a large proportion of the remaining three hundred candidates would be eliminated in the professional examinations to be held the following April, thus assuring that only candidates of "excellent capacity" would finally receive certificates.³ District superintendents were utilized by the Board of Examiners as members of examining committees. The Board of Examiners expressed itself as feeling justified in the policy of eliminating some candidates by evaluation of records as the first step in conducting principals' examinations and believing that the same procedure would prove valuable if examinations were utilized to select principals of high schools and district superintendents.⁴

Sex distinctions.- New appointments in New York were as follows in 1928: 14 men and 4 women; in 1929, 15 men and 11 women; in 1930, 12 men and 8 women; and in 1931, 17 men and 15 women. The ratios of men to women in elementary-school principalships during the same years were 221 to 202 in 1928; 193 to 192 in 1929; 192 to 188 in 1930; and 203 to 194 in 1931. In St. Louis

¹Ibid., p. 27.

²Seventy-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1927, p. 26.

³Thirtieth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 324.

⁴Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 461.

the ratio of men to women in the elementary-school principalships during the period 1921-1927 was approximately two to one. This ratio was somewhat compensated for by the situation in the supervisorships, where the ratio was practically reversed.¹

Training and experience.- Data concerning 103 principals employed in St. Louis in 1926 showed that nine had less than two years training beyond college entrance requirements; two had two years; two, three years; fifty-one the bachelor's degree; thirty-six, the master's degree; and three, the doctor's degree. Two of 110 principals had 6-10 years of teaching and administrative experience; five, 11-15 years; fifteen, 16-20 years; eighteen, 21-25 years; twenty-seven, 26-30 years; nineteen, 31-35 years; nine, 36-40 years; and fifteen, 41 or more years. The coefficient of correlation, according to the Superintendent's Report, between the experience and general training of the regular principals, was found to be $-.50$, with a probable error of $.091$, and the correlation between experience and professional training, $-.41$, with a probable error of $.052$.² Data concerning candidates on the eligible list at the time likewise indicated advancing standards in the general and professional training of principals.

¹Seventy-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 72.

²Seventy-second Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF THE PRINCIPAL

The earliest index of the professional status of the principal was the amount of salary he received in proportion to the salaries of other educational workers. The following excerpt from the minutes of a town meeting held in Providence, April 26, 1800, bears on this point:

"That there ought to be four principal Masters appointed at a salary of Five Hundred Dollars per annum each, to be paid quarterly, and so many ushers or assistants, as the Town Council shall find necessary, at such salaries as the Council shall allow."¹

At a meeting in November of the same year the salaries of the assistants were fixed at two hundred dollars per year.² Thus, the professional status of the principal, as measured by salary, was considerably in advance of that of the teachers. Further clues to the professional qualifications of these forerunners of the modern principal were furnished by reference to one of them as the "Rev'd. Mr. Wilson," and by the statement that they were present at the meeting for consultation on "Business relative to said Schools."³

Evidences of Professional Growth of Principals Prior to 1900

The principals in Providence received no increase in salary until 1835, when an increase of \$100 per year was given. At the same time the salary of the assistants was made \$300. In 1838, the salary of the principals was raised to \$800, and that of men assistants to \$400. Women were introduced as assistants during this year, at salaries of \$225. Cincinnati, in 1836, paid men principals \$500, and men teachers \$300.⁴ During the period

¹Report of the School Committee of Providence, 1900, p.16.

²Ibid., p. 20.

³Ibid.

⁴Seventh Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1836, p. 9.

1842-50, the salaries of men principals were advanced from \$45 to \$65 per month. In 1850, the salary of principals in Providence was \$1000, and that of teachers, \$250. In 1853, the top salary of principals in New York was \$1500; that of teachers, \$800. Up to the middle of the century, therefore, the top salary of the principal in large cities was approximately double that of the teachers.

The differences in salaries for men and women principals were due to the fact that women principals were usually heads of primary schools, of primary departments in large schools, or of girls' departments in grammar schools. The divergence between salaries paid the two groups was marked, as shown by the data of Table V. New York at this time graded the salaries of principals

TABLE V
MAXIMUM SALARIES PAID TO MALE AND FEMALE
PRINCIPALS IN LARGE CITIES, 1855

City	Male Principal	Female Principal
Boston	1800	450
Chicago	1200	--
Cincinnati	1020	504
New York	1500	700
Philadelphia	1200	600

according to the attendance of schools. As early as 1850, the board report contained a criticism of disproportionate salaries paid to principals, it being pointed out that the merits of the principals could hardly be as "various as their salaries," even though a salary which was appropriate for some might not be just for others.¹

The salaries of principals of grammar and elementary schools, in comparison to those of superintendents and high-school principals, furnished another index of the principal's professional status.

In Providence, the salary of the grammar school principals in 1858 was \$1,100 and that of the superintendents was \$1650; in 1864 their respective salaries were \$1200 and \$1800. The

¹Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1850, p. 20.

proportion in 1866 was \$1,800 to \$2,250.¹ In Chicago, the maximum salary of an elementary principal in 1858 was \$1500 and that of the high-school principal, \$2000; in 1865, the ratio was \$1700 to \$2000; and in 1868, \$2000 to \$2500.² In St. Louis, however, elementary principals had a maximum salary approximately one-half that of the high-school principal. The salaries in 1860 were \$1250 for the elementary school principal, and \$2500 for the high-school principal, but in 1866, the ratio was somewhat improved, being \$1700 to \$2750.³

By 1866, the principal's maximum salary in New York reached \$3000 per year. In 1872 the maximum salary for principals in Providence was \$2000; in Cincinnati, \$2100; in St. Louis, \$2200; in Chicago, \$2200; and in New York, \$3000. The range \$2000-\$3000 showed that, in so far as salary was concerned, the principalship in large cities fifty years ago offered financial rewards not inconsiderable when compared with those of college teaching and professions other than teaching.⁴

Awakening to need for professional growth.- Superintendent Philbrick of Boston was one of the first to call attention to the needs of principals to develop themselves professionally. In 1868, he devoted considerable space in his report to the kind of men needed in the principalship. They should not only be first class men, he stated, but they "ought to be thorough masters of the art and science of education."⁵ Once a principal was elected to what was virtually a permanent position, the essential question regarding him, Dr. Philbrick held, was, "does he grow?" The candidates naturally would be taken from the ranks of the submasters, but they should be selected only after a careful canvass which should include questions not only as to scholarship, but as to improvement while in the service. The first question, Philbrick contended, should be, "What has he done in his school?" and the

¹Annual Report of the School Committee, 1900, op. cit.,
pp. 84-85.

²Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1868, p. 299.

³Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1866, p. 11 (Appendix).

⁴Sixth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1904, p. 126.

⁵Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1868,
pp. 176-77.

next, What has he done "outside his school?"¹

Early principals' associations.- Principals began early to form clubs for the purpose of discussing their problems. Among the first of these associations to receive comment in the reports of superintendents were those of Cincinnati and Chicago. Such organizations were welcomed by school officials not only as evidences of professional interest on the part of principals, but as aids in giving unity and purpose to the work of the school system. The comment of Superintendent Hancock of Cincinnati in 1869 regarding the principals' organization of that city is herewith quoted:

"The Principals have an Association, which holds its regular meetings each Saturday preceding the bill days of the Board. The purpose of these meetings is the discussion and adoption of such measures as shall render the work of the schools more efficient. In addition to these regular meetings, extra ones are held, from time to time, for the consideration of special questions of pressing moment. The opportunity thus afforded for a full and free interchange of views cannot but result in great benefit to the schools, the experience and opinions of each teacher by this means becoming the common property of all. And I gladly avail myself of the present opportunity of acknowledging my obligations for the many valuable hints I have received from discussions engaged in by these practical workers in the field of education."²

That Superintendent Hancock was sincere in his statement of the value of the Association was evidenced by the fact that he had the secretary of the Association prepare a table showing not only the attendance and absences of principals at meetings of the organization during the year, but the cases of tardiness as well! The record of attendance at the seventeen meetings held during the year was, on the whole, commendable, but the embarrassment of those who were late seven, eight, or nine times, on seeing their misdemeanors published, can well be imagined. It may be safely assumed that the meetings during the following year were less disturbed by late comers; however, no further data on the attendance of principals at the meetings of their association appeared in the Superintendent's reports.

The principals of Chicago formed an association in 1870 for the consideration of "matters of instruction and discipline." Superintendent Pickard welcomed the appearance of the organization

¹Ibid., p. 178.

²Fortieth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1869, p. 47.

as a boon to the work of the schools.¹

In 1874, the Superintendent gave high praise, in his report, to the work of the Association. He enumerated as representative topics of discussion at the monthly meetings, oral instruction, treatment of dull pupils, dangers of "over-education," possibilities of commercial work in district schools, and instruction in morals. He stated that much of the progress during the past few years was traceable, in a large measure, to the influence of the association. It fostered friendly feeling among school people, awakened educational thought, cemented diverse interests, and effected unity of effort.²

The Detroit Principals' Association was formed in 1894. The purposes were to promote social intercourse and mutual assistance among members, and to further the welfare of the schools. During the school year 1898-99, the first meeting had as the main topic, "the schools from the citizen's standpoint." Prominent citizens joined in the discussion. The topics for the other meetings were spelling, literature in the schools, including the school library, literature for the grades and "poems of place," the stereopticon as a factor in education, school-room decoration, and the educational literature of the year. An excursion to Washington for teachers in the system, and an art exhibit to raise money for pictures for the schools, were special projects organized by the association.³

Principals in Cleveland were commended by Superintendent Draper in 1894 for conducting the "Principals Round Table" on professional topics.⁴

Salary Schedules, 1875-1900.- Chicago early introduced a salary schedule with yearly increments,⁵ but there was no specification beyond length of service by which such increments were to be earned. The most common method of advancing principals in salary, however, was according to size of schools. A schedule

¹Sixteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1870, pp. 126-27.

²Twentieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1874, pp. 113-14.

³Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Detroit, 1899, pp. 63-65.

⁴Fifty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1894, pp. 40-41.

⁵Eleventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1865, p. 11 (Appendix).

established in Chicago in 1875 contained provisions both for years of service and size of schools. Principals of schools having 12 to 15 rooms started at \$1200 and advanced by increments of \$200 each year to a maximum of \$1800; principals having schools of 16 to 19 rooms advanced from \$1400 to \$2000 in four years; and those in schools of 20 or more rooms advanced from \$1600 to \$2200 with the same yearly increments.¹ New York continued to pay principals according to size of school. In 1878, principals of schools having 150 pupils or less received \$2250; 151 to 300 pupils, \$2500; 301 to 500 pupils, \$2750; 501 or more pupils, \$3000. Women principals were paid from \$1200 to \$1700, but they were usually heads of girls' departments of the grammar schools. An exception to size of school was made in case a principal had more than fourteen years of service, in which instance men principals received a minimum of \$2500, and women principals a minimum of \$1900.² St. Louis, in 1879, paid principals of schools of the first class, \$2000, of the second class, \$1800, and of the third class, \$1500. Cleveland in 1884 used eight different classifications of grammar schools for salary purposes.³

In 1891, male principals in New York, regardless of the size of the school, were granted the maximum salary of \$3000, provided they had fourteen years of service and a "meritorious and uniformly excellent record" for five years preceding the application for increase. Such increases were granted only by vote of the board of education.⁴ This is one of the first references to merit as a means of advancing on a principals' salary schedule.

Comparatively little change was made in the maximum salaries paid to principals in large cities during the final quarter of the century until well toward its close. An exception was the period immediately following the Panic of 1873, when salaries of school employees were temporarily reduced in many cities. In Chicago, the reduction was perhaps the greatest -- a flat decrease

¹Twenty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1875, p. 175.

²Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1878, pp. 41-44.

³Forty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1884, p. 131.

⁴Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1890, p. 35.

of 25 per cent.¹ In New York City² and Providence,³ the reductions during this period were considerably smaller, approximating 5 per cent.

Early professional activities of principals.- Unquestionably many early projects intended by principals for the study and improvement of their work, failed to be permanently recorded, and were lost to the profession. In 1867, an assistant superintendent reported that one of his principals had devised a complete system of school records for use in his school. They were so effective that the assistant superintendent had a set prepared for his own use, and specimens were published in the Superintendent's report. Among the forms were an admission book, a daily attendance book, a weekly report form, a pupil-list form, and a register for the boys' departments.⁴ Experimental schools were directed by principals in 1871, and in 1874, two principals were praised by their superintendent for establishing and editing "The Chicago Teacher" an "excellent" monthly periodical.⁵ In 1892, regulations permitting principals to visit other schools to gain new professional ideas were recommended by superintendents to be extended in order to permit principals to visit schools in other cities. At the same time, it was recommended that principals showing exceptional professional initiative be rewarded by promotion to larger schools and, consequently, to higher salaries.⁶ Three associations of principals were reported in New York City in 1893 at which questions of school management and instruction were the bases of discussion.⁷ Principals in Chicago were credited at the time with providing presentations of educational theories and principles to form the main program of the superintendent's monthly

¹Twenty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1876, p. 18.

²Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1877, p. 21.

³Annual Report, op. cit., p. 85.

⁴Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1867, pp. 84-94.

⁵Twentieth Annual Report, Chicago, op. cit., p. 20.

⁶Fifty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1892, p. 160.

⁷Fifty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1893, pp. 124-25.

meetings.¹ In 1899, a superintendent quoted, for the consideration of district superintendents, from an article of a principal published in the Educational Review regarding grading.² During the same year, principals were requested to answer questionnaires on the educational merits of kindergartens.³

Evidences of professional status as revealed by principals' examinations.- The earliest requirements for the principals' certificates in large cities did not include specific knowledge of educational methods or supervision. The examinations for a male principal's certificate in Cincinnati in 1848 were in the common branches and natural history, natural philosophy, algebra, and the constitutions of United States and Ohio.⁴ In 1860, however, the theory and practice of teaching was included, as were also physiology, chemistry, astronomy, geometry, and trigonometry.⁵ Examinations for the principalship in Chicago in 1868 contained no questions on educational procedures.⁶ Candidates for principals' certificates in New York City in 1898 had to write a three-hour examination on history and principles of teaching, in which the questions were based on psychology as applied to teaching, history of education, and the curriculum. A three-hour examination in methods of teaching, very specific in nature, and an examination of like duration in school management, were also required. The other subjects were academic in nature.⁷ Two years of professional study in a department of education or a normal school might be offered in lieu of a certain amount of teaching or supervisory experience, and teachers not having college degrees were required, after 1900, to have two years of pedagogy approved by the state superintendent, in addition to ten years of teaching experience in the public schools of New York.⁸

Pronouncements of superintendents regarding the

¹Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1892, p. 35.

²First Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1899, pp. 114-17.

³Ibid., p. 123; 263-305.

⁴Nineteenth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1848, pp. 72-73.

⁵Thirty-first Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1860, p. 71.

⁶Fourteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 33-34.

⁷First Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 198-214.

⁸Ibid., pp. 168-70.

professional growth of the principal.- Superintendents in large cities were aware of the need of professional growth of principals well before 1900. Superintendent Brooks of Philadelphia in 1897 stated that the principal should guide the professional reading of his teachers. He also advised principals to do graduate work in pedagogy in the University of Pennsylvania.¹ Superintendent Soldan in commenting on the authority of the principal in 1898 expressed the opinion that it could best be maintained by "constant self-improvement, reading, and study" and that without these, scholarly qualifications soon became obsolete. An excerpt from this discussion of thirty-five years ago merits the attention of progressive administrative officers of today:

"In these days of marked and rapid advance in the philosophy of education, in child study, and in practical methods, it is not enough for a principal to possess the routine efficiency and the successful experience derived from many years of practice in managing schools. In qualifications confined to routine ability there is not a sufficient element of progress. There is good teaching done elsewhere, and the child has a right to demand that his leader, on whom his education depends should be informed of the best work and thought current in educational literature and practice. He should be able when occasion arises to give good pedagogical reasons for his practical methods and directions, more valid than "I think so" or "this is the way in which I think it ought to be done." Constant professional growth is even more necessary for the principal than for the teacher, because it is proper that the officer should keep in advance of his soldiers. The principal must keep in touch with the living, spiritual progress of the age, and, above all other things, he should be a well informed student of educational matters in theory and practice."²

The following year Superintendent Maxwell pointed out that if the principal were a student of education, his influence would pervade the entire school, improving the work of both the weak and the strong teachers. Where teachers were "sunk in ruts thirty years deep," he stated, the cause was often attributable to the fact that the principal never was, or had ceased to be, "a student of the world, of books, and of children."³ Maxwell at the same

¹Annual Report of the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia, 1897, pp. 20-21.

²Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1898, pp. 85-86.

³First Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 55-58.

time warned principals against the lowering of professional prestige by the use of political influence to secure promotions to higher positions.¹

Superintendent Brooks of Philadelphia cited the fact that principals were active in studying for the Ph.D. degree, taking up the work in the University of Pennsylvania as early as 1892. Six supervising principals had won the degree by 1897.²

The Professional Status of Principals from 1900 to 1918

Provisions of salary schedules.- Salary scales in St. Louis in 1901 classified elementary principals into seven separate groups, on the basis of size of school. The range of salary for elementary principals of the class A school (18 or more teachers) was from \$1751 for the first year to \$2060 for the fourth year; for principals of Class B schools (14 to 17 teachers) \$1545 to \$1854; and for principals of Class C schools (10 to 13 teachers), \$1284 to \$1545. In comparison, the maximum salary of supervisors of kindergarten was \$1931.25, and of supervisors of music, drawing, and primary work, \$1854. The salaries of high-school principals ranged from a minimum of \$2472 to a maximum, attainable in five years, of \$3605.³ No mention was made of professional improvement as a requirement for receiving increments in salary. The schedule in force in New York at this time provided for a minimum of \$2750 for men and \$1750 for women in schools having 12 or more classes, with yearly increments of \$250 until the men attained a maximum of \$3500 and the women, \$2500. The male supervisors of music and of manual training received a maximum of \$4000, and male supervisors of physical education, \$3000. The female supervisors of music, drawing, and kindergarten received a maximum of \$2500. The maximum salary of high-school principals was \$5000 in schools having 25 or more teachers; \$3500 in schools having less than 25 teachers.⁴ The school boards of the various boroughs were authorized by law to grant increases to principals. The borough board of superintendents made the recommendations and were guided

¹Ibid., p. 87.

²Annual Report of the Board of Public Education, 1897, op. cit., pp. 94-95.

³Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1901, p. 43.

⁴Second Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1900, p. 111.

"by merit, by the grade of class taught, by the length of service, or by the experience in teaching of the incumbent," or by a combination of these factors. In 1899, out of 196 principals entitled to advancement through length of service, 183 were recommended because of meritorious services.¹ Here, also, no provision was made requiring the principal to show professional improvement before receiving increments in salary.

Superintendent Cooley of Chicago in 1903 expressed dissatisfaction with the limitations of length of service and size of school as the sole bases of determining salary schedules, and recommended the following provisions:

"1. That principals of elementary schools who have reached the maximum salary in the third group, whose average in efficiency as shown by the records in the Superintendent's office, shall be 80 per cent, or above, shall be permitted to advance to the second group of salaries upon passing an examination in school management and methods of instruction in primary and grammar grades.

"2. That principals who have reached the maximum salary in the second group, whose average in efficiency, as shown by the records in the Superintendent's office, shall be 80 per cent, or above, shall be permitted to advance to the first group of salaries upon passing an examination in professional work, including school management, psychology, pedagogy, and the history of education; provided, that nothing in this schedule shall be construed as abolishing the restriction upon the salaries of principals on account of the membership of the schools as provided in the present schedule."²

This recommendation, later³ adopted by the Board, marked one of the first attempts to place salary increases on a professional basis.

Cooley went a step further in 1906, recommending that principals eligible for promotion be allowed, if they so elected, to substitute five university credits for the examination required for passing to a higher group. Each course was to consist of twenty-four lessons of one and one-half hours, or thirty lessons of one hour, and was to be such as would be accepted for the degree of master of arts in an accredited institution authorized

¹First Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., pp. 147-49.

²Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1903, pp. 18-19.

³Ibid., p. 34.

to confer such a degree. Not more than two courses could be taken during a given school year, and at least one course had to be completed during the two years next preceding the promotion sought.¹ Since the principal was required to pass to two consecutive higher groups to reach the maximum salary, the courses to be taken would approximate in number those required for the master's degree. A weakness of the plan was that it did not limit the courses to be taken by principals to education and related fields.

The size of the school as an element in the maximum salary of principals claimed considerable attention during this period as indicated in salary schedules, but opinion of superintendents regarding it was by no means unanimous. Unfortunately the reactions of principals regarding the policy were not recorded in superintendents' reports, but it was pointed out in 1905 that there were two phases of the problem which merited the attention of principals: (1) should principals having schools with more than forty teachers receive more pay than principals in schools with twenty teachers, and (2) should principals successful in small schools be advanced to large schools as a means of promotion. The belief was expressed that paying the same salary, regardless of the size of the school, took away incentive from the principal of the small school and made it appear that individual initiative and professional spirit were not recognized.² Seven years later, however, a greatly differing opinion was voiced by the superintendent of a large city system. After declaring that large schools made for mechanical administration by the principal, and that schools should be limited to a size permitting the personal influence of the principal to permeate the school, this official pointed out that paying higher salaries to principals of large schools placed a quantitative measure on the principal's value, and that a better policy would be to provide additional clerical help to relieve principals in large schools from increased routine duties.³

Regardless of dissenting opinions, such as the foregoing, principals continued generally to be paid according to size of school. New York, in 1907, showed signs of dissatisfaction with sex discrimination in the salary schedules of principals. Superintendent Maxwell reported that it was fully as difficult to

¹Ibid., pp. 250-51.

²Seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1905, pp. 171-72.

³Fifty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1912, p. 116.

obtain women principals with requisite professional attainments and executive ability as it was to obtain men principals, and recommended that as soon as money was available, women principals be placed on the same salary schedule as the men.¹ A law embodying this recommendation was passed in 1911.²

The salaries of principals continued to increase during the early years of the present century. In Chicago, the average yearly salary of principals in 1904 was \$2266.52, and the maximum was \$2500.³ In 1909, the maximum had risen to \$3500.⁴ Maximum salaries in St. Louis advanced from \$2060 in 1901 to \$3000 in 1909. The minimum and maximum salaries of principals of elementary schools of the first rank, of principals of high-schools,⁵ and of supervisors of drawing in representative large cities in 1909 are shown in Table VI. Supervisors of drawing were selected for purposes of comparison since their salaries average higher than those of supervisors of music or other special subjects. Nevertheless, the salaries of elementary-school principals were higher than those of supervisors of special subjects in four cities, equal to them in one city, and lower in only one city. Maximum salaries of elementary-school principals were exceeded by those of high-school principals to a marked degree only in Cincinnati and San Francisco. In Chicago, the elementary-school principal of highest rank had a maximum salary only 8 per cent lower than that of the high-school principal of the highest rank, and 29.3 per cent higher than high-school principals of the lowest rank. In New York, elementary-school principals of the highest rank had maximum salaries equal to the high-school principals of the lowest rank. The elementary-school principals must be regarded, therefore, as commanding salaries, at this stage, which compared very favorably with those of other workers in public school systems.

Data are available, moreover, which show that principals' salaries increased consistently over a period of years in given

¹Ninth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1907, p. 131.

²Fourteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1912, p. 214.

³Fiftieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1904, pp. 67-69.

⁴Fifty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1909, p. 17.

⁵Fifty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1909, pp. 216-19.

TABLE VI
SALARIES OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORS IN SIX LARGE CITIES IN 1909

Positions	Boston		Chicago		Cincinnati		New York		St. Louis		San Francisco	
	Min.	Max.	Min.	Max.	Min.	Max.	Min.	Max.	Min.	Max.	Min.	Max.
Elementary Principals	2580	3180	1800	3500	1900	2400	2750	3500	2150	3000	2460	2460
High-school Principal	3204	3780	2700 2200	3800 2700	2600	3500	5000 3500	5000 3500	3500	4000	2700	3300
Supervisor of Art	3000	5000	1800	1800	1900	2400	3500	4000	2300	2500	1920	1920

cities, keeping pace with the percentages of increase for other supervisors, and teachers in the public schools. In St. Louis, for example, the average salaries of principals showed increases over the average salaries in 1895-96 as follows: in 1900-01, 5 per cent; in 1905-06, 25 per cent; in 1910-11, 41 per cent; and in 1914-15, 59 per cent. During the period 1895-1915, the total percentage of increase in supervisors' average salaries was 32 per cent; and in assistant-supervisors' average salaries, 37 per cent. The percentages of increase in minimum salaries for elementary-school principals were 110 per cent; for supervisors, 7 per cent; for assistant supervisors, 82 per cent; and for high-school principals, 67 per cent. The percentages of increase in maximum salaries were: elementary-school principals, 50 per cent; supervisors, 60 per cent; assistant-supervisors, 25 per cent; and high-school principals, 67 per cent.¹

Activities of principals' associations.- The organization of the principals of Chicago into twelve committees by Superintendent Cooley and the formation of a central council consisting of the chairmen of these committees,² have been mentioned in a previous chapter. The Superintendent, during the years 1902-1909, utilized the Principals' Association as the agency for disseminating the plans worked out in these committees among principals, teachers, and at times, pupils. The Superintendent met with the twelve chairmen of the committees on the first Monday evening of each month, and discussed with them plans for future meetings of the Principals' Association. Each committee prepared a report to the Association which was printed and distributed among principals before the monthly meetings of the Association. By this means, it was hoped that principals would be able to consider each report, and discuss it with their teachers, and thus be prepared to discuss it effectively before the Association. The first reports were on mathematics, discipline, office work of the principal, and manual training. The Board recognized the value of the reports by having the report on mathematics printed and distributed to pupils of the eighth grade. At the end of the first year of the policy, materials for the revision of courses of study, and for a manual for the guidance of teachers, were being collected.³

The Association functioned as the chief medium of the

¹Sixty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1915, pp. 295-303.

²Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1903, op. cit.,
p. 12.

³Ibid., p. 12.

Superintendent for planning and putting into effect new educational measures. The affairs of the Association appeared among the regular items of business published in the official bulletins of the Board of Education. The following excerpt from the Board of Education Bulletin illustrates the way in which co-operation among administrative officers was effected:

"PRINCIPALS' ASSOCIATION

"The next regular meeting of the Principals' Association will be held at Fullerton Hall, the Art Institute, on Saturday, Feb. 7, 1903, at 10:30 A.M. The Committee on Relations of High and Elementary Schools will present its report on the Departmental Plan in Elementary Schools.

"After the meeting in Fullerton Hall the principals, superintendents, and members of the Board will take lunch together at the Victoria Hotel.

SUBJECT, AFTER LUNCHEON
'The Course of Study'¹

The Detroit Principals' Association included in its active membership special teachers and supervisors as well as principals of all ranks. In 1911, past activities of the Association were summarized. They consisted of studies and discussions of such topics as school management, teaching of English, arithmetic, and spelling, recreation of pupils, instruction in nature study, the school newspaper, punishments, literature in the schools, and current professional literature. Lecturers on professional topics were engaged to appear before the Association; lecture and extension courses were organized for principals and teachers; and welfare movements, such as retirement, improved salaries, and membership in teachers organizations were encouraged.²

The women principals of Detroit in 1911 formed an additional association for women who were principals, assistant principals, supervisors, and department heads in high schools. The organization was known as the Detroit Women Principals' Club and its aims were to forward the educational interests of the city and to promote closer fellowship among its members. The men principals likewise had a separate association for principals of their sex, which was later extended to include all male educational workers

¹Ibid., p. 21.

²Sixty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Detroit, 1911, p. 189.

of the city and became known as "The Schoolmen's Club."¹

The women principals in New York City formed a principals' association of their own. In 1911, this organization formulated twelve rules on care of the eyes, and had them printed in label form, to be pasted in all school books.² The men principals of schools in St. Louis having eighteen or more teachers formed an organization known as "The Principals' Club." It was limited to white principals, and its purposes were to promote professional good fellowship, to form a clearing house for the exchange of ideas, and to study problems of instruction and administration. During the year 1916-1917, the topics considered were a closer organization of teachers' organizations, extra-school activities, the supervision of special subjects, and teachers salaries.³

Minutes of principals associations during this period indicated that officers and members, when not maintaining close relations with superintendents, were prone to devote the major portion of their attention to securing better conditions of teaching and administration, rather than to studying the problems of the principalship.⁴ How far principals' associations would go to bring about conditions satisfactory to their members was revealed by the activities of the Principals' Club of Chicago in 1909 to obtain the election of a local candidate for the superintendency rather than a candidate from outside the system. A special meeting of the Club was called, for the purpose of presenting to the Board of Education a list of local candidates, any one of whom, if elected would make a capable superintendent of schools. After a day of discussion and voting, a list of ten candidates was prepared. At a later meeting, the list was reduced to five candidates, consisting of the president of the normal college, an assistant superintendent, and three principals. This list, together with a letter stating that the Club favored the election of a local candidate, was forwarded to the Board of Education. How much this action influenced the Board at the subsequent election is not known, but one of the candidates on the Club's list was elected superintendent.

¹Ibid., pp. 191-92.

²Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1911, pp. 186-87.

³Sixty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1917, p. 30.

⁴Minutes of the Chicago Principals' Club (Chicago, Illinois, 1911). Published in Chicago Principals' Club Reporter, June 16, 1911, pp. 6-7.

A complete account of the activities and statements of the Club was published in the proceedings of the Board.¹

Activities of principals in connection with courses of study.- The construction and revision of courses of study were among the early mediums through which principals rendered professional service and also developed themselves professionally. Principals in New York and Chicago were especially active during the first years of the present century in constructing courses of study. At times new courses were the work of a principal and teachers in a given school;² usually, however, principals worked in committees at the request of the superintendent.³ In Chicago, as has been noted, Superintendent Cooley utilized committees of the Principals' Association⁴ whereas his successor, Dr. Young, employed committees of principals working in conjunction with district superintendents and members of the faculty of the normal school.⁵ Courses of study were constructed by principals in all of the elementary-school subjects, in industrial subjects for Grades VI-VIII, in vocational subjects, and in many academic subjects in high school.⁶

Pensions, retirement, and tenure of principals.- New York City had pension and retirement provisions fixed by statute as early as 1895. In that year, according to the report of the Superintendent, thirty-six principals and assistant teachers were retired.⁷ The following passage appeared in the report of the Superintendent for 1901:

"On the recommendation of the city superintendent, said board of education shall have power, by a two-thirds vote of all its members, to retire any member of the teaching or supervising staff, including the members of the board of

¹Proceedings of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1909, pp. 768-69.

²Tenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1908, p. 171.

³Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1911, p. 185.

⁴Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1903, op. cit., pp. 12-14.

⁵Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1910, pp. 85-87.

⁶Sixty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1915, pp. 25-29.

⁷Fifty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1895, p. 149.

examiners, who is mentally or physically incapacitated for the performance of duty, and has been engaged in the work of teaching or school supervision for a period aggregating thirty years, twenty of which have been in the public schools of The City of New York.

"And the board of education may retire from active service any member of the said teaching or supervising staff who shall have attained the age of sixty-five years and shall have been engaged in the work of teaching or school supervision for a period aggregating thirty years, twenty of which shall have been in the public schools of The City of New York."¹

Numerous instances of suits brought by principals regarding their tenure as principals were cited in the reports of the Superintendent during the early years of the century, and the evidence is that statutes gave the principal in New York ample protection with respect to tenure.² Boston secured pension and retirement legislation in 1900.³ In 1915, three principals of St. Louis petitioned the Board of Education in behalf of the "Teachers' Pension Organization," asking that the Board officially recognize the Teachers' Benevolent Annuity Association which for fifteen years had been providing partial support for superannuated, retired teachers.⁴ Leaves of absence for the purpose of advanced study were granted in 1915, with the provision that upon return from such leave, the teacher or principal would be assigned to the salary to which he would have been entitled, by schedule, had the leave not been taken.⁵ Tenure for principals and teachers in Chicago was provided by statute in 1916.⁶

Professional investigations, reports, and services of principals.- A sampling of miscellaneous professional services rendered by principals during the period 1900-1917 shows that

¹Third Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1901, p. 87.

²Tenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 379-80, 415.

³Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1929, p. 86.

⁴Sixty-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 319-21.

⁵Ibid., p. 40.

⁶Proceedings of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1917, pp. 1731-38.

principals initiated changes in school hours for half-day kindergartens (Chicago, 1902), formed committees of elementary and high-school principals for improving relations between elementary and high schools (Chicago, 1903), were appointed by superintendents to serve as members of the examining boards of city school systems (Chicago, 1903), originated types of pupil government of schools (New York, 1905), reported on original effort of pupils in the light of pedagogical principles (Chicago, 1904), formulated model programs for summer schools which the Superintendent published and utilized (New York, 1907), investigated subsequent careers of eighth-grade graduates to determine effects of vocational guidance (St. Louis, 1913), originated charts by which teachers determined hygienic and physical conditions of their pupils (New York, 1913), made studies of individual cases of retardation of pupils (Detroit, 1915), and co-operated with the faculties of professional schools in the use of scientific tests (St. Louis, 1915). In 1911, principals in New York were publishing accounts of their activities to such an extent that an associate superintendent was constrained to accuse principals of a tendency to publish accounts "of everything they are doing." However, his complaint appeared to be based on the fact that fine work was often done in schools whose principals did not "advertise,"¹ a circumstance which may have resulted from the failure of these principals to publish practices of interest and service to the profession.

Views of superintendents regarding the professional status of principals.- The views expressed by superintendents from time to time indicate that they were sentient to the principal's professional growth and to conditions which promoted or retarded it. As early as 1902, the following passage appeared in the report of Superintendent Seaver of Boston:

"As to the general extent or area of a principal's duties, it may be said that this is marked out and limited by the personality of the principal himself. The greater the man the larger the area of his duty. The whole of a man's time and strength are due to his school. The man who has other business -- other absorbing interests -- cannot discharge his full duty to his school. He may, indeed, fulfil the terms of his contract, live up to all the requirements of the school regulations, and even receive a measure of official or of popular commendation; and yet, tempted by foreign interests, he may construe his duty to his school narrowly, may neglect his professional improvement -- cease to grow -- and so fall short of the highest professional success he is capable of.

¹Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 239.

The school needs not only all that the principal is, but all that he can become in a long-life service."¹

The principal, according to Seaver, should not only improve himself, but lead his teachers to develop themselves professionally.² An associate superintendent in 1904 cautioned principals against measuring their work by business standards, such as emphasizing their "office" practices, keeping specific hours, and utilizing outside occupations to increase their incomes. He pointed out that professional products of the school could not be "tagged, numbered, and laid on a shelf." He also advised young principals to spend extra school time on problems connected with their schools, rather than on evening school and vacation school work.³ The policy of giving candidates who were on the eligible lists for principalships apprenticeship training as assistant-principals until they were appointed was explained in 1911 and its advantages were indicated.⁴ High-school principals were appointed from the ranks of heads of departments in high schools, rather than from elementary-school principals in New York City,⁵ but general excellence in conducting an elementary school was the prerequisite for promotion to a district superintendency in Chicago.

Questions in principals' examinations.- The questions asked in principals' examinations showed little advancement in the scientific knowledge of education expected of candidates for the principalship prior to 1914. Principals in a self-survey in Chicago in 1914 recommended professional standards to be met by candidates for the principals' examination, and requirements which should be enforced to validate certificates which had lapsed.⁶

Professional study in summer school and extension classes.- There was little evidence of principals' taking summer courses and extension courses in education until shortly before 1914. In St. Louis extension courses were provided for teachers,

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1902,
p. 68.

²Ibid.

³Sixth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit.,
p. 125.

⁴Thirteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., pp. 168-69.

⁵Fifteenth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of
Schools of the City of New York, 1913, pp. 217-18.

⁶Sixtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of
Chicago, 1914, p. 146.

principals, and supervisors by Teachers' College of that city. In 1912, sixty-eight enrolments of principals in such courses were reported,¹ and in 1914, the superintendent commended very highly the study being made by principals in courses bearing on their problems. The following excerpt from the report of the Superintendent describes the nature of the courses taken by principals:

"C. The Scientific Study of Education.- For the past four years a large class of principals, supervisors, high-school teachers, and members of the faculty of the college have spent an hour and a half every Saturday morning during the Winter Extension term in the study of the principles and problems of School Supervision and Administration. In addition to a large and successful experience in these lines of school work, members of this class almost without exception, have had university training to the extent at least of a Bachelor's degree, and some of them hold the Master's, and a few the Doctor's degree. The first year was devoted to an effort to define the principles which should regulate the practice of school supervision as distinguished from teaching, criticism, and administration

"The second year was devoted to a consideration of certain problems involved in the supervision of school work in St. Louis, in the light of the conclusions reached in the first year's study. This was also a very valuable year to all of us.

"During the third year the theory of City School administration was taken up and dealt with in much the same way as the theory of supervision during the first year; and the fourth year was devoted to a study of the problems of City School administration."²

Superintendent Blewett also pointed out that study of their problems by principals in professional courses was especially important in view of the growing complexity and importance of the principal's work. No principal, he felt, could measure up to the responsibilities of his position without being a scientific student of present day problems of education.³ He presented data to show that principals recently appointed in St. Louis had the equivalent

¹Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1913, p. 95.

²Sixtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1914, pp. 144-45.

³Ibid., p. 145.

of at least five full years of college or university work including at least one and one-half years of professional training, and that the standards of both general and professional training required of principals were constantly increasing.¹ Superintendent Frederick of Cleveland in 1916 stated that the large number of principals taking summer courses at universities of national standing and courses during the year in local universities and the normal school of the city were evidences of the concern of principals to prepare themselves adequately for scientific supervision.²

The Professional Advancement of Principals Since 1918

Salary schedules.- Salaries of principals increased after the World War, coincident with a scarcity of teachers -- particularly men -- and increased living costs. Increases during the three year period 1921-1923 for representative large cities are shown in Table VII. The median salaries of high-school principals

TABLE VII

INCREASES IN SALARIES OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN LARGE CITIES, 1921-1923

City	First Quartile			Median			Third Quartile		
	1921	1922	1923	1921	1922	1923	1921	1922	1923
Chicago	3700	3700	4400	4250	4250	4800	4250	4250	4800
Cleveland	2541	2655	2705	2746	2840	2975	2855	2970	3090
Detroit	3200	3237	3200	3200	3648	3600	3600	4057	4000
New York	--	--	4756	--	--	4771	--	--	4785
St. Louis	2950	3150	3150	4000	4006	4000	4000	4054	4053

increased during these years from 5000 to 5700 in Chicago, 4400 to 4510 in Cleveland, 5000 to 5500 in Detroit, and remained the same in St. Louis. The median salaries of elementary teachers increased from 1975 to 2500 in Chicago, 1680 to 1800 in Cleveland, 1800 to 1854 in St. Louis, and remained the same in Detroit.³ Thus, the proportion of increase in the salaries of principals

¹Ibid., p. 30.

²Eightieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1916, p. 28.

³Data secured from the 78th, 79th and 80th Annual Reports of the Board of Education of Detroit, 1921, 1922 and 1923, pp. 9-10; 10-11; 12-13.

compared favorably with those of other workers in the system.

The maximum salary for supervisors of kindergarten, music, handwriting, and physical education in St. Louis was made equal to the maximum salary for the highest rank of elementary-school principals in St. Louis in 1919. Salaries of assistant supervisors in the special subjects, however, were approximately one-half those of the elementary principals.¹ The policy was followed in subsequent salary schedules in St. Louis.

In ten large cities in 1923 elementary-school principals on the highest levels of the salary schedules received salaries of \$4000 or higher, and in four cities, salaries of \$4500 or more. A unique situation in Chicago at this time was that, due to overtime service, the median salary of elementary-school principals was \$5027, whereas the maximum salary was \$4800.² The median salary of elementary-school principals was 63 per cent higher than that of high-school teachers in Chicago, 59 per cent higher in Milwaukee, 57 per cent higher in Buffalo, and 50 per cent higher in St. Louis.³ The maximum salary of elementary principals was exceeded by that of junior high-school principals in St. Louis in 1923 by 12 per cent. Of eleven other cities having populations in excess of 300,000, seven had junior high-school maximum salaries less than 12 per cent higher, and seven had senior high-school maximum salaries less than 25 per cent higher, than the maximum salaries of the elementary-school principals.⁴

In 1927, two extra-school committees in New York City, one consisting of citizens representing civic and social organizations, and the other appointed by the mayor, proposed new salary schedules for principals. The Citizens Committee proposed a minimum of \$5064, a maximum of \$6144 over a period of four years, and a super-maximum of \$6900, over a period of seven years for elementary principals. The Mayor's Committee proposed three ranks of salaries according to size of schools. Principals in schools having 25 to 48 classes were to have a minimum of \$5000, and a maximum of \$6000; those in schools having 49 to 84 classes, a minimum of \$5500 and a maximum of \$6500; and those in schools having 85 or more classes, a minimum of \$6000 and a maximum of \$7000. All these were to be attainable in three years. The suggested schedules reveal a high regard by prominent citizens of the professional status of the principal. The schedule officially adopted

¹Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1919, p. 195.

²Seventieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1924, p. 31.

³Ibid., p. 43.

⁴Ibid., pp. 46-47.

reflects the proposals of the two committees.¹ It is shown in Table VIII. Beginning in 1931, however, principals were placed under a single schedule, regardless of the size of school.²

TABLE VIII

SALARY SCHEDULE OF PRINCIPALS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
HAVING 25 OR MORE CLASSES, 1929

Year	Number of Classes		
	25-48	49-84	85 or more
1	5000	5500	6000
2	5250	5750	6250
3	5500	6000	6500
4	5750	6250	6750
5	6000	6500	7000

The maximum salary for elementary-school principals of the first rank in St. Louis rose to \$5000 in 1925. In Chicago, the maximum salary remained at \$4800, although Superintendent McAndrew stated in 1925 that principals, as "managers of important establishments," deserved better pay.³ In 1926 McAndrew proposed a new schedule with a maximum of \$6250 which was rejected⁴ after much controversy. In 1933, the salaries of principals, in common with those of other employees of the Board of Education, were reduced 15 per cent as an economy measure,⁵ making the maximum \$4080 for elementary principals.

The data on methods of transfer from one salary level to another within the schedules of the various cities are meager. Chicago utilizes largely the same method of promotion from one group to another as was inaugurated by Superintendent Cooley in

¹Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1927, p. 132.

²Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent of the City of New York, 1930, p. 88.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1925, p. 38.

⁴Proceedings of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1927, pp. 1432-33.

⁵Proceedings of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1933, p. 647.

1906, with the exception that there are at present two groups instead of three. In New York, eligibility requirements were established for assignments of principals in the higher salary schedules, the Board of superintendents considering length and character of service when filling vacancies in the larger schools. Principals were asked to make a statement as to whether they wished to transfer to larger schools, and a list of such candidates was established. The principals expressed considerable gratification at having been considered on the basis of merit, rather than being required to make a formal request for promotion.¹

Professional activities of principals' associations.- The associations of principals in large cities received considerable stimulation from 1922 to the present from the activities and example of the National Department of Elementary School Principals. This was especially true with respect to the study of problems affecting the principal's work and the publishing of the results of investigations and progressive practices in supervision and administration. The Chicago Principals' Club, for example, in 1925 published a booklet on "The Chicago Public Schools, How They Teach Helpful Living and Help the Handicapped," and a handbook for principals. The Club also prepared two booklets on supervision, and published the "Reporter," the regular monthly publication of the club. Superintendent McAndrew enumerated, as further activities of the club in 1925, the aiding of the Superintendent in compiling new rules, preparation of a course of study in citizenship, assisting in preparation of salary schedule, co-operation in securing desired legislation, conducting a daily column on school services in the Chicago Daily News, providing weekly programs for radio, holding a weekly class in school finance, formulating a policy for clerical work, co-operating with the Board's expert in codifying forms and blanks, reporting on assignment and rating of substitutes, making three outlines for teaching aids, providing for seventy-five addresses before community organizations, and experimenting with radio as a teaching tool.²

Beginning in 1926, the Chicago Principals' Club published yearbooks as follows: 1926, "The Causes of Failure and Remedial Measures"; 1927, "A Co-operative Report of the Studies of the Curriculum and of Supervision"; 1928, "The Second Co-operative Report of Studies of the Curriculum and of Supervision"; 1929,

¹Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1925, pp. 200-202.

²Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1925, op. cit., pp. 45-52.

"Educational Measurement"; 1930, "Health Education"; and 1931, "Character Education."¹ Similar studies were made and published by principals' associations of Cincinnati and other large cities. The Principals' Association of New York made a study and report on silent reading in 1926,² and in 1930, made three special recommendations to the Superintendent regarding standards for the assignment of visiting teachers.³

Principals' part in curriculum construction.- The role of principals in revision and construction of courses of study was more limited in the years following 1918 than in previous periods, owing undoubtedly, to the growing conception that curriculum making was a process demanding co-operative effort of all workers in a school system and advice of professional experts in curriculum construction from outside the system. Moreover, many city school systems established bureaus of curriculum, in charge of trained directors, and superintendents usually placed these officers in general charge of curriculum revision. Nevertheless, principals, whether through recognition of their strategic position in the school system, or through acquiescence of superintendents in their demands, or both, continued to exercise a dominating influence in curriculum revision. The procedure followed in St. Louis in 1925, as described by Director Cocking of the Division of curriculum, illustrates the trend of co-operative effort and recognition of the principals' leadership. The policy was to place the administrative phases of curriculum construction on "the administrators of the system, namely, the principals," the productive aspects largely on those closest to the children, the classroom teachers, and the installation process jointly on teachers, principals, and supervisors.

The first step in the procedure was the appointment of four principals by the Superintendent, representing the four divisions of the school system, the kindergarten-primary, elementary, intermediate, and high-school divisions, to determine the general aims of the public school system. This committee, after devoting

¹Chicago Principals' Club Reporter, December, 1931, pp. 19-20.

²Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1926, p. 132.

³Thirty-second Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 45.

three months exclusively to research and study of curriculum practices, formulated sixteen principles for guidance in determining general aims. The committee next made a tentative draft of general aims, which in turn was considered and revised by a larger committee consisting of twelve principals. The committee of twelve principals then proceeded to determine the aims of each division of the school system on the basis of the general aims already proposed, and when a tentative draft was prepared, it was presented for study and criticism to the entire body of principals, to the whole supervisory staff, and finally, to all of the teachers. The teachers who worked on the committees constructing the courses were selected by the principals.¹

In the revision of the courses of study in New York, initiated in 1925, principals were made general chairmen of each large division of subject matter, such as the social studies, English, and the like, and also chairmen of the committees on the subdivisions of the subjects, such as history, geography, composition, and spelling. The functions of the general chairman were to expedite the work of the various committees in his charge, to co-ordinate their efforts, and to secure unity and agreement in the subdivisions of the subject and to adjust the subject to the course as a whole. Each chairman of an individual subject committee had approximately four teachers under his direction, one of whom was freed from classroom work to act as secretary of the committee.² After the courses were drafted, committees of principals were appointed by district superintendents to study them and adapt them to use with various ability groups of pupils.³

Principals in Chicago, who had become accustomed to constructing all courses of study through committees of the Principals' Club, were reluctant⁴ to surrender this opportunity for professional service which had been theirs for so long a period. They were credited with opposing the chairmanship of district superintendents, and teacher membership, in important curriculum committees, in 1925. They were also regarded as hostile to the

¹Seventy-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1926, pp. 39-43.

²Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1926, p. 126.

³Thirty-third Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1931, p. 440.

⁴M. O. Saunders, "Development of the Powers and Duties of the Superintendent of Chicago Public Schools." Unpublished study, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1930.

establishment of the bureau of curriculum established by Superintendent Bogan in 1928.¹ Principals in Boston prepared an outline entitled "Citizenship Through Character Education." The work was characterized by Superintendent Campbell as an "epoch making document."²

Sabbatical leave.- The provisions for sabbatical leave for teachers for purposes of travel and study in Chicago, New York, and other large cities usually apply to principals as well. The privilege has not been utilized in Chicago by principals, especially the men, as much as could have been desired. Since the establishment of the sabbatical leave in 1927, fewer than ten per cent of more than 300 principals have availed themselves of this opportunity for professional development. In New York, on the other hand, the first year after the institution of the policy found it necessary for the Board of Education to grant leaves in excess of the initial provision, 289 teachers, principals, and other supervisors having applied.³

Investigations and experiments on principals' problems.- Investigations by principals became so numerous during the period that no attempt can here be made to describe or enumerate them. In New York City alone, the Superintendent made reference in his reports to investigations and experiments by principals in such fields as local school organization, nutrition of first grade children, procedure in classroom routine, retardation, spelling, parental response to remedial dental work, pupil preparation for classwork, Dalton Plan, teacher improvement in service, clerical work, visual education, administrative duties of the principal, relations with parents and public, rating of teachers, use of libraries, extra-curriculum activities, and many other topics of a like nature. Handbooks and pamphlets on the teaching of various subjects were published as aids to teachers. Professional investigations, such as those enumerated, have been typical of principals, working as individuals and in groups, in all large cities during the past decade.

Professional development as revealed by principals' examinations and the promotional procedures of superintendents.- The requirements for principals' certificates in large cities during this period showed a definite departure from sole dependence

¹Ibid., p. 23.

²Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1931,
p. 13.

³Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent,
op. cit., p. 209.

on written examinations, and a greater amount of credit for graduate degrees and courses in education.¹ Principals' examinations, too, contained a greater proportion of questions involving scientific methods of supervision of instruction, and fewer questions on routine administration and traditional subject matter.² A study of the records of candidates for principalships in St. Louis in 1926 showed that 106 of 144 candidates had 30 or more hours of professional study. The records of principals then in service showed that 55 of 109 principals had 30 or more hours of professional study, 36 had the masters degree, and three had the doctor's degree.³ Thus professional study was becoming a very important factor in the principal's training.

An index of the attitude of principals themselves toward professional training was secured through questionnaires sent to elementary-school principals by the Board of Examiners in New York City in 1926. The object of the examiners was to ascertain whether the principals were in agreement with the current policy of giving greater weight to pedagogy than to subject matter in the examinations for the highest teacher's certificate in the ratio of approximately two to one. Seventy-six of 242 principals were in favor of more subject matter and less professional material, 148 were for a continuance of the current policy, and 18 were in favor of even a greater proportion of professional material.⁴

The value of professional development as a basis for promotions in the service has received growing recognition from superintendents. Twenty-six principals were candidates for district superintendencies in New York in 1931. The Superintendent secured permission from the Board of Education to have the Board of Examiners evaluate the qualifications of all candidates as a basis for filling future vacancies.⁵ That principals, however, were not always willing to depend on professional means to secure promotion is evidenced by a statement of Superintendent McAndrew of Chicago

¹Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1923, pp. 85-87.

²Records of the Board of Examiners of Chicago, Principals' Examination, April 28, 1926.

³Seventy-second Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 26-30.

⁴Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 448.

⁵Thirty-third Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 473.

in 1925, which reads as follows:

"A principal desiring promotion who writes to an office holder, 'A word from you to the Superintendent will put me farther ahead than any other consideration,' indicates unfitness to have charge of the preparation of citizens."¹

The Superintendent in New York City in 1927 cautioned principals that objections to form new junior high schools must be based on professional considerations, and not on the desire of certain principals to remain in charge of a school of current organization. This statement undoubtedly referred to the desire of some principals to retain a school having eight grades, and possibly, an organization large enough to meet the requirements of a certain level in the salary schedule of principals.²

Utilization of extension and lecture courses in education.- Principals in St. Louis and Chicago were cited for participation in professional courses pertaining to the problems of the principal. In Chicago, 18 of the 24 high-school principals were organized by the University of Chicago in a seminar in administration conducted by members of the faculties of leading professional schools and by superintendents,³ and at the close of the course, the principals voted that it be continued for another year. Principals in New York showed great interest and co-operation in conferences arranged by associate superintendents and conducted by members of faculties from prominent professional schools. They were also instrumental in securing enrolments of their teachers in courses in education.⁴ Activities of this nature led Superintendent Broome of Philadelphia to cite the professional leadership of the principal as one of the outstanding features of the work in his school system.⁵

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1924, p. 17.

²Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., p. 25.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent, 1925, op. cit., p. 100.

⁴Thirty-third Annual Report of the City Superintendent, op. cit., pp. 137, 141.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia, 1926, p. 289.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

An important factor in the early development of the modern principalship was the growth of cities, which caused school enrollments to grow rapidly, resulting in a great increase in the number and size of schools. The earliest superintendents, finding it increasingly difficult to give personal attention to the grading of schools, delegated the responsibility of local supervision to principals.

The grading of schools influenced the development of the principalship to a marked extent. It led to the introduction of systematic courses of study. It revealed the obstacles to continuity of work caused by separate departments, and the necessity of having a single directing head of the school.

The unification of all departments of the school under one head marked a distinct advance in the status of the principal. Fortunately the new and growing cities of the West -- notably Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Chicago -- were less influenced by traditional handicaps than the older cities of the East, and consequently were able to adopt the unified school at comparatively early dates. Most large cities of the country had adopted the policy of the unified school by 1860.

Another important step in the development of the principalship was the freeing of the principal from the responsibility of classroom teaching. The grading of schools and the introduction of courses of study made it necessary for the principal to visit the classrooms, and inspect the work of other teachers. The first stage in freeing the principal was the establishment of the position of head-assistant. This teacher took charge of the principal's division part of the time, devoting the remainder of her time to clerical duties. In several of the largest cities, principals were freed from all responsibility for classroom teaching prior to 1870.

Administrative Responsibilities

The earliest administrative responsibilities of the principal were largely clerical. A sampling of duties prescribed by school boards prior to 1845 showed that 58.8 per cent pertained

to records and reports; 23.5 per cent, to organization and classification; 11.8 per cent to care of building and equipment; and 5.9 per cent to discipline and care of pupils. These duties prescribed for the "principal teacher" were based on expediency; that is, they were designed to keep the school going rather than to improve the quality of the work. They required no special ability or training, and could have been performed by any capable teacher.

Emphasis in administrative responsibilities shifted during the last half of the century from records and reports to organization and general management. City populations continued to grow rapidly. Schools were often large and overcrowded, necessitating complex forms of organization. Large numbers of new and untrained teachers had to be initiated into the rudimentary requirements of keeping order and following the course of study. Such conditions resulted in materially changing the nature of the principal's administrative activities. New administrative duties prescribed by boards of education during the period 1853-1900 were distributed as follows: organization and general management, 40.5 per cent; equipment and supplies, 15.2 per cent; records and reports, 13.9 per cent; discipline and care of pupils, 12.7 per cent; building and ground, 7.6 per cent; and miscellaneous duties, 10.1 per cent. The principal had become the directing manager, rather than the "presiding teacher," of the school.

Principals regarded a number of powers granted to them during the closing decades of the Nineteenth Century as marked increases in the prestige of the principalship. Illustrative of these were the right to graduate pupils on the bases of the principal's standards, the right to have orders or suggestions to teachers given only through the medium of principals, and the right to a voice in transfers and assignments of teachers connected with their schools. Principals had the right to direct teachers, enforce safeguards to protect the health and morals of pupils, supervise and rate janitors, require the co-operation of parents, and requisition educational supplies. They were clearly recognized as the responsible administrative heads of their schools.

Principals spent considerable effort during the opening years of the Twentieth Century to secure stabilization of their teaching staffs. In some respects, they made gains; in others, they had difficulty in maintaining ground already won. The gains secured by principals were powers, such as retaining cadets to fill existing vacancies, approving or rejecting requests of teachers to transfer to their staffs, and the selecting of head-assistants when vacancies occurred. Nevertheless, conditions, such as rapid change in the social character of districts, the

opening of many new schools, and the increasing distances for teachers to travel, made it increasingly difficult for principals in decadent districts to maintain stable staffs. The argument of teachers that it was a hardship for them to travel a long way to work usually had greater weight with school officials than the principal's argument that such transfers were detrimental to the best interests of the pupils.

Principals were generally given a free hand in assigning teachers to grades and rooms. Practically the only restrictions were when additional salaries or bonuses for teachers were involved. In such cases, the approval of the district superintendent was required before changes could be made. In other cases, assignments were left to the decision of the principals, unless clear lack of good judgment was evident.

Much progress was made during the period 1904-1914 in the matter of clerical help. The first step in many cities was to provide substitute teachers to do clerical work instead of relying on the part-time services of regular teachers. In some systems, such teachers were called "extra-teachers." The number of teacher clerks depended on the size of the school. In Chicago, a school was not entitled to a full-time clerk unless it had twenty-five or more divisions. In New York, one clerk was assigned to schools having from twelve to forty-seven classes; two, to schools having from forty-eight to sixty-seven classes; and three, to schools having sixty-eight or more classes. In 1927, cities of 100,000 or more had one clerk for approximately each fifteen teachers.

Principals devised many forms of organization during the period 1900-1917 which were instrumental in breaking up lock-step procedures. Multiple systems of grading, dividing pupils into fast, medium, and slow groups, and providing special divisions for atypical children, were examples of caring better for individual needs of pupils. Sometimes experimenting with new types of organization grew out of need for meeting crowded conditions, as in the case of double schools, half-day divisions, and modified forms of the platoon.

Some powers were gained by principals in the physical aspects of school work. A greater share was granted them in determining the kind and amount of textbooks and other educational supplies in the decade 1900-1910. On the other hand, many principals regarded the transfer of much of the responsibility for the physical care of the plant to building engineers as a loss to the prestige of the principalship.

Many advances made by principals did not come as a result of board regulations, or powers conferred by superintendents. Principals, utilizing their creative and inventive powers,

initiated many projects to enrich the work of their schools. Creative administrative projects, such as pupils' clubs, supervised playground activities, safety programs, equipping schools with radio and visual apparatus, and organization of the school for civic training have been initiated since 1900. Undoubtedly, much information concerning the nature and dates of such activities was lost through failure to preserve the reports of principals.

The latest trend in school-board regulations is to grant broad general powers to principals, though in some cities these are supplemented by detailed requirements. The general duties usually charge the principals with the organization, administration, and supervision of their schools. The real test of the authority of the principal, however, is the attitude of the superintendent. If the superintendent believes in highly centralized control, the initiative and influence of the principal will be dwarfed, regardless of the wording of board rules. If the superintendent, on the other hand, recognizes and encourages local effort, the principal's sphere of activity will be increased and his administrative effectiveness will approach its maximum.

Supervisory Functions

The principal's supervisory functions began when school committees found that direction of instruction was becoming too complicated and time-consuming to be carried on by lay persons, and delegated certain responsibilities to principals. One of the first responsibilities so delegated was to take charge of meetings of teachers pertaining to the methods and materials of instruction. By the middle of the Nineteenth Century principals in Cincinnati had made beginnings in teachers' meetings, class visitation, pupil adjustment, measurement of pupil progress, rating of teachers, and instruction in methods -- virtually all of the phases of modern supervision.

Superintendents at first failed to visualize the principal as the chief factor in local supervision. However, the classification of pupils, installation of courses of study, and the introduction of new subjects, such as music, drawing and physiology, demanded more local attention than superintendents could give. Accordingly, attention was focussed on making the principal the medium for carrying out the superintendent's supervisory policies. As early as 1862, principals were expected to supervise instruction and conduct model exercises for their teachers. By 1867, superintendents were visiting other cities to study the work of principals, making the activities of principals an important topic

in their annual reports, and crediting unusually good classwork chiefly to supervision by principals.

During the sixties and seventies, principals of grammar schools were also given the supervision of tributary primary schools. The policy, however, was largely discarded in the eighties, due to the increase in the number of assistant superintendents, and the growing tendency to unite primary and grammar departments in the same building.

The supervisory activities of principals during the last quarter of the century were unmistakably influenced by the current ideal of superintendents -- a well graded system of schools. Principals were advised to keep teachers working "in unison" on "the same general plan." They were encouraged to maintain a uniformity of progress throughout their schools. Courses of study insuring continuity of materials, and teaching manuals specifying details of method, were to be followed closely. Principals were expected to know what each class was doing at any hour. Inspection and examinations were the chief devices of principals in maintaining this lock-step progress.

One of the most serious problems encountered by principals during the period was the instruction of large numbers of inexperienced, untrained teachers. Normal schools were not yet able to meet the demands for trained teachers, and reliance often had to be placed on grammar-school graduates. Possibly this situation accounted for some of the emphasis on lock-step progress, since the supervision of large numbers of poorly qualified teachers would be facilitated by adherence to a uniform plan.

Principals attained recognition well before 1900 as the directors of instruction in their schools. However, their supervisory technique was rudimentary in character. Although they were required to carry out the policies of the central office, opportunity was not lacking for the exercise of freedom and initiative in supervision. This was evident from the fact that certain principals were credited with important creative supervisory projects. Lack of dynamic supervision on the part of the main body of principals was undoubtedly due to conservatism and professional inertia.

About 1900, improvement was evident in certain supervisory practices of principals. Rating of teachers became more concise and more professional in character; tests were used for modifying methods as well as for determining progress; and methods and materials were better fitted to the needs of special groups of children. From 1908-1915, especially, principals experimented with double-track plans, and with special rooms for over-age pupils. Creative supervisory devices, such as experiments in

unifying kindergarten and first grade work, special drill materials, new methods of rating and reporting on pupils' work, and grouping pupils within classes, were widely reported by assistant superintendents. By 1917, it was evident that principals were awakening to their potentialities as supervisors and were greatly extending the scope of their supervisory activities. They were still satisfied, however, with rule-of-thumb procedures; the need for critical study of supervisory techniques was not yet recognized.

The supervisory functions of principals have undergone great development since 1920. Standardized achievement tests and group intelligence tests have proved effective tools in making supervisory procedures precise and rendering results of supervision subject to evaluation. Principals have become skilled in conducting experiments involving classroom methods and materials. They apply the methods of case study to solve the difficulties of mal-adjusted pupils; they diagnose teaching and learning difficulties; and they classify pupils on scientific bases. Best of all, principals now tend to be critical of their own practices and to apply the methods of science to bring about improvement.

Relations with General and Special Supervisors

Assistant superintendents were introduced in most large cities during the period 1850-1870. Their first duties were to inspect schools, examine classes, and give advice to principals and teachers, but they dealt mainly with principals as soon as the latter assumed local responsibility for supervision. They rated principals, utilized meetings of principals for disseminating supervisory policies, and held individual conferences with them regarding improvement of their schools, as early as the seventies.

The use of examinations by assistant superintendents for evaluating the work of schools was a frequent cause of friction between early assistant superintendents and principals. As early as 1859, assistant superintendents in New York were obliged to yield in a controversy over the use of examinations. Principals, feeling strongly intrenched with local officials, often passively, and sometimes openly, resisted policies inaugurated by the general supervisors. In St. Louis, in 1866, and in Chicago, in 1884, principals were authorized to manage the internal affairs of their schools without interference. Superintendents generally voiced the policy that the individuality and prestige of the principal were not to be impaired.

Assistant superintendents were rarely delegated specific powers with respect to principals and their schools. Instead,

they were expected to depend on suggestion and advice for inaugurating their supervisory procedures. Some supervisors opposed this policy, believing that the mutual duties of the two groups of officials should be clearly defined; others favored it, expressing the opinion that permitting the principals independence resulted in better adapting schools to meet local needs, and in pioneering in educational methods. The policy, adopted prior to 1900, is still in general practice today.

Little change resulted in the relationship between principals and general supervisors from 1900 to 1918, but after 1918, the testing movement and the growth of professional attitudes among principals brought marked improvement. Evidence showed that scientific approach to problems common to the two groups of officials minimized the personal element, and made verifiable conclusions possible. Replacement of subjective personal opinion by fact-finding methods promises to establish sound professional relationships between principals and general supervisors.

Special supervisors followed in the wake of early teachers of music, drawing, and German. When these special subjects, introduced about the middle of the Nineteenth Century, became general throughout the grades, directors and their assistants usually assumed full charge of them. Thus principals and regular teachers had an early precedent for evading responsibility for the special subjects. Toward the close of the century, some school boards, with the object of economy, attempted to make the principal and regular teachers responsible for all special subjects, but in each case, the special supervisors and assistants were restored.

Since about 1900, superintendents as well as principals have, by and large, been satisfied that principals should be mainly responsible for the special subjects. There has been, however, a question as to how much expert assistance the principal and the regular teachers need from the special departments. A noteworthy plan was initiated by Superintendent Cooley in Chicago in 1903 to eliminate all but a few special supervisors and have these act as technical advisers of principals. Departmentalization was to provide selected teachers for the special subjects, and the Normal College was to give special pre-service and in-service training in the special subjects. With this set-up, principals were to take complete responsibility for the special subjects. However, Cooley found difficulty in getting principals to live up to the new responsibilities, and the policy was discarded by his successor. Superintendent Maxwell of New York in 1915 was of the opinion that regular teachers were only in part qualified to instruct in the special subjects, and principals could not reasonably be expected to render all of the technical

advice needed. He believed in a strong corps of special supervisors to act as technical advisers. St. Louis, about the same time, established a large corps of special supervisors, who were subject, while in the schools, to the authority of principals.

The present policy in most large cities is to have the principal responsible for supervision of the special subjects, with supervisors as technical assistants and consultants. Principals are expected to make the most efficient use of the special services. The opinion appears to be that principals and regular teachers are not yet sufficiently qualified to dispense altogether with the services of special supervisors.

The Principal as a Community Leader

The earliest responsibilities of principals with respect to their school communities were prescribed by school boards. They usually dealt with petty grievances of citizens living near school houses, provisions regarding contagious diseases, and the like.

Principals, however, soon began to go into their school community for aids in making their school work more effective. For example, as early as 1881, certain principals were securing supplementary reading materials from public libraries. The first large movement for community co-operation initiated by principals was mother clubs, in 1894. The clubs aroused the interest of parents in children's health, recreation, and habits, and in improved methods of parental control. Prior to 1900, principals held entertainments in the evenings which were forerunners of social centers. They were also active about this time in advocating and organizing vacation schools.

Principals took a prominent part, in the first decade of the present century, in the establishment of social centers. They were generally regarded by superintendents as the logical organizers of social centers, and in some cities, as in Chicago in 1907, they took the lead in establishing them. Principals proved especially successful in securing the support of philanthropical and social agencies. The published reports of Chicago principals, 1910-1912, furnished a body of information on suitable activities for social centers.

Beginning about 1904, principals initiated a great variety of activities to interpret the work of the schools to parents. These involved meetings of parents in the schools, at which various phases of the work were explained and often illustrated by lantern slides, demonstrations and exhibits, and special visiting days. In 1912, and the years immediately following, many parent associations were formed.

Principals were particularly active, during the period 1905-1917, in utilizing community resources for improving the work of the schools. Securing help of social agencies for penny lunches, enlisting home support for pupils' gardens, and extending school credit for home activities were examples of enlisting community support. Medical services were secured for indigent pupils; co-operation of banks was obtained in thrift projects; aid of civic agencies was enlisted for suppressing the evils attendant on satellite stores; and chambers of commerce were induced to sponsor civic leagues in the schools.

Principals conducted community surveys as early as 1912. The surveys were usually made to secure information regarding the economic and language backgrounds of the pupils, or to ascertain causes of truancy.

Since 1918, improvement in community leadership of principals has been chiefly in conducting drives, such as Education Week, in securing school publicity through the radio and the city press, and in training pupils in concrete acts of citizenship in the community through such mediums as clean-up campaigns, sane celebrations of holidays, and co-operation with public services. Principals have actively co-operated with police and fire departments to promote safety, and with election officials in getting people in foreign districts to vote regularly. Such contacts have greatly widened the educational sphere of principals in their school communities.

The Personnel of the Principalship

The first principals were selected by city officials, or by school inspectors whom they appointed. Later they were selected by committees of school boards. School boards in many cities left the nomination of principals to ward trustees long after they had superintendents and certificating requirements. It was not until well toward the close of the Nineteenth Century that principals were selected by superintendents.

Certificates were required of principals as early as 1838. Early certificates of principals were merely the highest forms of teachers' certificates. They were based chiefly on oral examinations in the common branches conducted by members of school boards. Later, the examinations were written, and such subjects as psychology and the theory and practice of teaching were required. By 1875, a rather clear line of demarkation between principals' certificates and those of teachers had appeared. At that time, professional training in normal schools or universities was not required.

About the opening of the present century, the scope of the examination in the professional subjects was greatly increased, and college degrees and credits in professional work were emphasized. The questions in the professional examination pertained largely to organization and to methods and materials in the teaching of the common branches. They gave consideration to the candidate's practical experience rather than to his knowledge of professional principles. Examinations for principals' certificates since 1900 show a steady development in the knowledge and use of scientific procedures and principles expected of candidates.

Experience in teaching was at first a very important factor in the qualifications of principals. As early as 1883 superintendents were beginning to recognize and point out that qualifications which made for success in classroom teaching were no guarantee of success in the principalship. By 1900, amount and quality of professional training generally superseded a long period of experience as a prerequisite. Recent development in certificating principals has been toward giving some credit for variety and quality of teaching experience, and special credit for administrative experience.

Personal qualifications received little consideration until superintendents became sentient to the principal's influence on the attitudes of teachers and pupils. In 1857, principals were characterized as being zealous, open-minded, and imbued with the spirit of progress. In 1868, special attention was paid to the culture, academic learning, manners, and moral sentiments of the principal, and raising of standards in examinations was at times cited as a means of insuring these qualities in the personnel of the principalship. The principal was expected, by 1871, to possess an "organizing mind" and a strong will. Before 1900, such attributes as loyalty to superiors, executive ability, tact, and willingness to incur responsibility were recognized as desirable. Reasonableness in use of authority over teachers was emphasized in 1902. Thus, most of the personal qualifications demanded of modern principals were sensed prior to the opening of the present century.

Men outnumbered women in the principalship by a wide margin up to about 1870. At that time Cleveland had embarked on the policy of employing women as building principals in all elementary schools. In many cities, however, women were limited for some time subsequent to 1870 to primary schools or elementary schools of small memberships. During the period 1900-1917, on the whole, approximately equal numbers of men and women were employed as principals, but discriminations against women frequently existed in the form of lower salaries, ineligibility to serve

after marriage, and infrequency of appointment to high school principalships. Women principals generally have had longer periods of service, and have been longer in local school systems than men. Recent practice has maintained the approximately equal distribution of the sexes in elementary-school principalships.

Eligibility lists of candidates holding principals' certificates were early established, but it was not until about 1900, when the superintendents gained the control of nominations, that order of merit on the lists was generally observed. A board of examiners, of which the superintendent was the chairman, usually prepared the lists. The board of examiners in New York in 1897 set standards for weighting experience, training, and personality which have required little revision to meet present-day needs. Since 1900, eligibility lists have been made shorter to provide for new developments in education and oral examinations for the purpose of evaluating personality have been given greater weight.

College degrees and normal school diplomas were not prerequisites for principals' certificates in many cities until the last decade of the Nineteenth Century. Shortly after 1900, college degrees were required in practically all large cities. Steadily increasing credit has been granted by examining boards for graduate degrees and professional courses. The master's degree or the equivalent in professional work is now possessed by most of the candidates for the principalship in large cities.

The Professional Status of the Principal

Principals were advised by Superintendent Philbrick in 1868 that they should be masters of the science of education, and that they should show continual growth, both in, and outside, their schools. In the decades subsequent to 1860 they formed associations in many cities to exchange experiences and opinions for the purpose of improving school work, a movement which won repeated commendation of superintendents. Certain individuals stood out from the rank and file of principals during this period in the initiation of professional activities. They devised new forms for administrative records, edited professional magazines, and visited schools in other cities to obtain new supervisory ideas. Superintendents, in the years immediately prior to 1900, pointed out that principals should do graduate work, guide the professional reading of teachers, and keep well in the lead of their teachers by constant attention to lay and professional literature.

The main body of principals, nevertheless, showed little disposition to improve themselves during the first decade of the

new century, if the work of principals' associations on courses of study is excepted. The main attention of associations during the period was devoted to the improvement of salaries, gain in the principals' administrative powers, and improvement of conditions under which principals and teachers worked. During the decade 1910-1919, the topics receiving attention were of a more professional nature, such as current professional literature, methods of teaching, extra-class activities, and organization of extension courses and lectures.

The salaries of elementary-school principals developed consistently in comparison with those of other educational workers in city school systems. They maintained an approximate ratio of two to one with teachers' salaries, and made gains in comparison with high-school principals. The policy of increments in pay for evidences of professional growth, rather than for mere length of service, made slow progress. For a long period, Chicago was the only large city to recognize this principle, even in part; now however, it has gained general acceptance in large cities.

Pension and retirement of principals were provided by statute in some large cities as early as 1895. Tenure for principals was established, under the same conditions as for teachers, in many large cities during the period 1900-1917. Sabbatical leave for study or travel, established mainly from 1920 to 1930, has opened new means of professional advancement for principals.

The greatest advance in the professional standing of the principal came after 1918, largely as a result of the formation of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association. The chief service of this organization was to make principals conscious of their professional possibilities and responsibilities. It stimulated them to study their own problems, to conduct experiments in their schools, and to publish the results of their investigations. Principals' associations organized group and individual investigations, and established year-books and monthly journals devoted to publishing the results of such studies. Bureaus of research in large cities provided tests and materials, and often personnel, to aid principals in the investigation of instructional problems. Professional schools organized after-school seminars for principals in service, and developed comprehensive programs of training for the elementary and secondary school principalships. Assistant superintendents cited principals as planning programs of improvement for their teachers, and conducting after-school and Saturday classes in methods of instruction. Thus, principals have tended to become students of the science of education, and the educational leaders of their teachers. They have sensed that the principalship is, in itself, a professional career.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Reavis, William C., Pierce, Paul R., and Stullken, Edward H. The Elementary School. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931. Pp. ix + 571.
- Small, Walter H. Early New England Schools. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1931. Pp. ix + 409.

Miscellaneous Material

- Annual Report of the School Commissioners of Baltimore, 1880-93, 1895-99, 1901-02, 1904-32.
- Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Boston, 1851-1911, 1915-17, 1919-33.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, 1854-1915, 1918, 1922, 1924-26.
- Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1833, 1835, 1838-53, 1860-62, 1865, 1867, 1869, 1872, 1894-97, 1900, 1906-11, 1915-17.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1866, 1868-80, 1883-87, 1894-95, 1897-1912, 1914, 1916-21, 1925-32.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of Detroit, 1885, 1894-99, 1909, 1911-18, 1920-31.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of Minneapolis, 1890, 1892, 1894-97, 1900-1901, 1904-14, 1924-28.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1850, 1853-56, 1858-96.
- Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, 1898-1917, 1921-23, 1925-32.
- Annual Report of the Board of Public Education of Philadelphia, 1847, 1849, 1851-52, 1857, 1866, 1870-71, 1881-85, 1893-94, 1900-1901, 1905-32.
- Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, 1870, 1883, 1885-91, 1893-1932.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1860-63, 1885-1933.
- Annual Report of the Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, 1883-84, 1889-95, 1897-98, 1907-10, 1912, 1924-33.

- Administrative Code of the Board of Education of Cleveland, 1925.
- Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Board of Education of Massachusetts, 1841, 1842.
- Chicago Board of Education Bulletin, 1902-08.
- Chicago Principals' Club Reporter, 1911-34.
- Journal of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1898-1910.
- Minutes of the School Committee of Boston, 1876-1905.
- Official Proceedings of the Board of Education of St. Louis, 1914-31.
- Principal Studies His Job. Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, Vol. VI, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1928. Pp. 82-148.
- Proceedings of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, 1873-1934.
- Proceedings of the School Committee of Boston, 1906-31.
- Report on the Condition and Improvement of the Public Schools of Rhode Island, 1845.
- Report and Documents Relating to the Public Schools of Rhode Island, 1848.
- Rules of the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore, 1929-30.
- Seventh Yearbook. Bulletin of the Department of Elementary-School Principals of the National Education Association, Vol. VII, No. 3. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1928. Pp. 130-704.

Unpublished Material

- "Circular of Information." Board of Examiners. Chicago Public Schools, July, 1930 (Mimeographed).
- Saunders, M. O. "Development of the Powers and Duties of the Superintendent of Chicago Public Schools." Unpublished study, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1930.

